

Lloyd C. Pulley to be postmaster at Ivor, Va., in place of C. E. Bristow. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

Nannie L. Curtis to be postmaster at Lee Hall, Va., in place of N. L. Curtis. Incumbent's commission expires May 10, 1936.

Thomas N. Carruthers to be postmaster at Purcellville, Va., in place of M. R. Piggott. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1936.

Claude Neale to be postmaster at Saluda, Va., in place of Claude Neale. Incumbent's commission expires June 28, 1936.

WASHINGTON

Harvey H. Hartley to be postmaster at Goldendale, Wash., in place of W. F. Byars. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1936.

WISCONSIN

Michael P. Becker to be postmaster at Brillion, Wis., in place of C. H. Kuehl. Incumbent's commission expires April 27, 1936.

Henry J. Thoma to be postmaster at Hartford, Wis., in place of F. M. LeCount. Incumbent's commission expires April 27, 1936.

Karl C. Neubauer to be postmaster at Horicon, Wis., in place of E. C. Rehfeld. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1936.

William Wright to be postmaster at Kewaunee, Wis., in place of F. A. Hanson. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1936.

Joseph C. Harland to be postmaster at Mukwonago, Wis., in place of W. F. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1936.

William Reuschlein to be postmaster at Plain, Wis., in place of L. J. Bettinger. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1936.

Louis J. Albrecht to be postmaster at Sheboygan, Wis., in place of H. E. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1936.

Allison L. McNeight to be postmaster at Stratford, Wis., in place of Mourits Mortenson. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1936.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 13, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of the rolling years, while we walk the changeable ways of time, grant us grace to feel and lament our sins. By prayer and meditation, prepare our hearts for deeper penitence and better lives. We pray for urgent wills and constructive spirits in all that we shall do, that the Republic may have a most honorable part in the world's life and character. Again we lift our souls in praise to Him who took up the morning stars and made them chime and swung them in the chanting choirs of the universe. Heavenly Father, keep alive in our breasts the One who faced failure, saved humanity, unsealed earth's tombs, and brought to man new courage and fresh inspiration. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 9, 1936, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On March 18, 1936:

H. R. 8886. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary

of the founding of the capital of South Carolina at Columbia, S. C.;

H. R. 10265. An act to authorize the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Treasury to lend Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and other needed equipment for use at the National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America; and to authorize the use of property in the District of Columbia and its environs by the Boy Scouts of America at their national jamboree to be held during the summer of 1937; and

H. J. Res. 443. Joint resolution to amend Public Resolution No. 31 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, approved June 17, 1935, so as to extend its provisions to cover the National Boy Scout Jamboree now scheduled to be held in 1937.

On March 19, 1936:

H. R. 9863. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes.

On March 30, 1936:

H. J. Res. 543. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1936 for emergency relief of residents of the District of Columbia.

On April 10, 1936:

H. R. 381. An act granting insurance to Lydia C. Spry;

H. R. 605. An act for the relief of Joseph Maier;

H. R. 685. An act for the relief of the estate of Emil Hoyer (deceased);

H. R. 762. An act for the relief of Stanislaus Lipowicz;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Herman Schierhoff;

H. R. 3184. An act for the relief of H. D. Henion, Harry Wolfe, and R. W. McSorley;

H. R. 3254. An act to exempt certain small firearms from the provisions of the National Firearms Act;

H. R. 3369. An act for the relief of the State of Alabama;

H. R. 4439. An act for the relief of John T. Clark, of Seattle, Wash.;

H. R. 5764. An act to compensate the Grand View Hospital and Dr. A. J. O'Brien;

H. R. 6335. An act for the relief of Sam Cable;

H. R. 7024. An act to authorize the sale by the United States to the municipality of Hot Springs, N. Mex., the north half of the southeast quarter and the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 6, township 14 south, range 4 west, New Mexico principal meridian, New Mexico;

H. R. 7788. An act for the relief of Mrs. Earl H. Smith;

H. R. 8030. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of Republican River, Smoky Hill River, and minor tributaries of Kansas River, with a view to the control of their floods;

H. R. 8032. An act for the relief of the Ward Funeral Home;

H. R. 8038. An act for the relief of Edward C. Paxton;

H. R. 8061. An act for the relief of David Duquaine, Jr.;

H. R. 8110. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Gardiner;

H. R. 8300. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of Suwannee River in the State of Florida, from Florida-Georgia State line to the Gulf of Mexico;

H. R. 8559. An act to convey certain land to the city of Enfield, Conn.;

H. R. 8577. An act to amend the Teachers' Salary Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 4, 1924, as amended, in relation to raising the trade or vocational schools to the level of junior high schools, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8797. An act to provide a preliminary examination of Onondaga Creek, in Onondaga County, State of New York, with a view to the control of its floods;

H. R. 8901. An act to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station at or near Apostle Islands, Wis.;

H. R. 9200. An act authorizing the erection of a marker suitably marking the site of the engagement fought at Columbus, Ga., April 16, 1865;

H. R. 9671. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to dispose of material to the sea-scout service of the Boy Scouts of America;

H. R. 10182. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire the timber rights on the Gigling Military Reservation (now designated as Camp Ord), in California;

H. R. 10185. An act to amend the act approved June 18, 1934, authorizing the city of Port Arthur, Tex., or the commission thereby created and its successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over Lake Sabine, at or near Port Arthur, Tex., and to extend the times for commencing and completing the said bridge;

H. R. 10187. An act to extend the times commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.;

H. R. 10262. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of certain bridges across the Monongahela, Allegheny, and Youghiogheny Rivers in the county of Allegheny, Pa.;

H. R. 10316. An act to legalize a bridge across Poquetanuck Cove at or near Ledyard, Conn.;

H. R. 10465. An act to legalize a bridge across Second Creek, Lauderdale County, Ala.;

H. R. 10490. An act to amend chapter 9 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto;

H. R. 10975. An act authorizing a preliminary examination of Marshy Hope Creek, a tributary of the Nanticoke River, at and within a few miles of Federalsburg, Caroline County, Md., with a view to the controlling of floods;

H. R. 11045. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between Rockport, Ind., and Owensboro, Ky.;

H. R. 11365. An act relating to the filing of copies of income returns, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11425. An act for the relief of Gustava Hanna;

H. R. 11945. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Department of Public Works of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for the construction, maintenance, and operation of certain free highway bridges to replace bridges destroyed by flood in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution accepting the invitation of the Government of France to the United States to participate in the International Exposition of Paris—Art and Technique in Modern Life—to be held at Paris, France, in 1937.

On April 11, 1936:

H. R. 6645. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes", approved May 25, 1926; and

H. R. 6982. An act to amend section 80 of chapter 9 of an act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 233. Joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the Great Lakes Exposition to be held in the State of Ohio during the year 1936, and authorizing the President to invite the Dominion of Canada to participate therein, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3483) entitled "An act to provide for rural electrification, and for other purposes", requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SMITH, Mr. WHEELER, and Mr. NORRIS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 11968) entitled "An act relating to the authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make rehabilitation loans for the repair of damages caused by floods or other catastrophes, and for other

purposes", disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. BULKLEY, Mr. TOWNSEND, and Mr. COUZENS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech on the subject of Unemployment by the Honorable JAMES M. MEAD at Buffalo, N. Y., April 5, 1936, at a banquet tendered in his honor by the postal employees of Buffalo and western New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech on the subject of unemployment, delivered by the Honorable JAMES M. MEAD, chairman of our Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, at a banquet tendered in his honor by the postal employees of Buffalo and western New York, on April 5, 1936:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished and honored guests, employees of the Post Office Department, ladies, and gentlemen, while I sincerely and genuinely appreciate this evidence of your friendship and loyalty, I cannot give expression to my real feelings of gratitude because of my very limited abilities. I am, however, very proud of my association with the Postal Service, and I thoroughly enjoy the many friendships I have made among the personnel of this great service.

I am happy to tell you that Buffalo ranks high up on the list of the major cities of the country in the efficiency and effectiveness of the Postal System. The friendly attitude of the Postmaster General and his capable associates is reflected throughout the service, and here in Western New York it can be truthfully said that patrons and employees are enjoying a New Deal that is in reality an era of good feeling and satisfactory service.

The Post Office Department in adopting the 40-hour, or 5-day, week has set a splendid example for private enterprise to follow. Just as the Postal Service took up the slack in the employment of its substitutes, so will private business take up the slack by returning millions of the unemployed to steady work again.

The governments of the world have many vexing problems to consider at this time, some of them military, others territorial, and others economic—all of them receiving the attention of layman and lawmaker. The most important national problem which must be solved at this time is unemployment. It must not be obscured by any other issue, whether political, social, national, or international. The indisputable high efficiency of modern machine methods has destroyed work opportunities which may only be regained by a compensatory reduction of the work period, whether it be the work day or the work week.

Shortening the hours of labor will bring wage earners now without work into the Nation's contributory business organization. Increasing existing earnings and augmenting purchasing power among those who are now unemployed, is our most immediate economic need. A shorter work period will release purchasing power and stipulate industrial productivity. Reduction of the work period will give to millions of our citizens a security denied them under existing circumstances. A reduction in the work period will increase by millions the consumer population for American business. It will at the same time increase our standards of living and create new and widespread demands; demands for goods as well as services. A reduction in the work period will enable the Government to reduce relief expenditures, eliminate relief agencies, reduce Federal taxation, and balance the Federal Budget.

However, until American enterprise recognizes the justice and the need of a shorter work day it will continue to be the duty of the Federal Government to provide work for its citizens.

In every age and in every country there has been opposition—bitter opposition to every effort on the part of the workers to secure a reduction in their work period, limiting by law or agreement the wage earner's workday, whether it was the establishment of the 10-hour day a hundred years ago or the 8-hour day 50 years ago.

Those same arguments have persisted throughout all these years and, without modification or improvement, are used today. Never before in the history of our country or, for that matter, of the world, has there been greater need for the reduction of the work period than exists right now. In no age in all the history of mankind has the worker been called upon to spend his energy and to give of his substance as is the case of the worker in the mass-production industries of today. Physical, mental, and nerve strain without sufficient rest or recreation wrecks the human body, and in less than a decade another derelict is thrown out upon the human scrap heap by our heartless profit-seeking industrialism.

There are many industrialists in our country who would most willingly join in a Nation-wide effort to restore jobs to the millions of our unemployed who, through no fault of their own, are without work tonight. In fact, many of our industrialists have already set the example and paved the way, but in this fight to

destroy poverty and to win security all must do their share and lend their cooperation. The milling industry here in our own city, Kellogg industries at Battle Creek, Mich., and the elevator-construction industry, are but three instances where the 6-hour day increased factory output, lowered unit costs of production, and in general increased the efficiency, the health, and the contentment of the worker. The tremendous increase in man-power productivity, the constantly diminishing labor cost in plant overhead, the tremendous losses in wealth production suffered by the Nation in periods of depression, the destructive moral effect of enforced indolence upon our wage earners, the danger to the permanency of our existing institutions makes necessary the universal reduction in the workday and the workweek.

Years ago man invented labor-making machines; today the inventive genius of our Nation invents the labor-saving machine. The teletype, the electric eye, the mechanical robot, remote control, and the cotton picker destroy labor employment at a rate never dreamed of in generations which have passed. Today America's productivity has attained the productivity of a normal year, and yet, primarily as a result of the machine, employment figures lag way to the rear. Over 5,000,000 of those who have lost their jobs as a result of the depression have been absorbed by industry. However, there are still 5,000,000 more to be absorbed, plus the millions who have become of working age since 1929. The American people could enjoy more leisure, higher consuming power, and increased production if the working day was shortened. This would compel industry to pay more rather than less for the undersupply of labor. It would give business the market it needs. Contentment and happiness would supplant idleness and fear, and the wheels of American industry would spin with a speed never before attained.

America is no longer a nation with acres of undiscovered virgin soil. Its national resources have been impaired, her forests stand devastated by the exploiter's hand, her foreign markets have been diminished by the machine productivity of other lands. Therefore, the solution of the problem of unemployment is a domestic one, one that we must solve here in our own land. We must revise our economic system. Every American who is now without a job must be looked upon as a potential consumer of American business. Working, he contributes to the common welfare; unemployed, he becomes the common problem of business, Government, and society.

America is ready and at the threshold of the greatest economic era in all the history of mankind. We have at hand the materials for a real new era. We have an industrial organization purged for the moment of the financial folly that leads to the crash. It has the tools, the skill, the experience, and only requires a free social conscience. All that is necessary is a common meeting of the minds of labor, of business, and of government.

America has never failed in all of the crises of the past. America will not fail in this crisis. It cannot fail because the security of the common man, the future well-being of the youth of our land, the permanent protection of our American institutions from suffering, poverty, and grief as a result of insecurity are all dependent upon the banishment of unemployment from our land. The constant and steady improvement in business, the tremendous increase in corporate profits, the growing strength of the American labor movement, the acknowledgment on the part of the vast majority of our people of the need of a new economic era based on social justice, the realization on the part of the officials of our Government that there is no other way out except by giving to the workers in industry a shorter workday and a shorter workweek is the solution of the national problem of unemployment.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes at the close of the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHANNON].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania on what subject he desires to speak?

Mr. RICH. The principal subject will be waste of money, and especially the Jefferson memorial proposed to be erected at St. Louis, Mo., and the waste of money by the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mrs. NORTON. Reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—this is going to be a busy day, and I shall be forced to object to any further requests for time until the District bills are disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN OBLIGATIONS TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been a revival in Europe of the sacredness of treaties and contracts. Criticism has been directed against Germany because she has failed to observe the agreement reached in the Locarno Treaty. With the European governments in the mood to appreciate the solemnity of contracts, I believe it an opportune moment for the United States Government to remind nations with whom we have debt agreements that those are just as sacred and just as binding as Locarno or any other agreement.

If one agreement can be repudiated at will, then the same principle must be applicable to every agreement, and the result is all agreements become documents upon which there can be no real dependence.

The soundness of this argument was confirmed lately in the English Parliament by Lloyd George, who propounded the query:

What is the difference between the violation by Germany of a treaty and that which you (England) are doing, in violating your agreement as against America?

The response was quite illuminating and plainly indicated the intention of British repudiation unless there is positive action by the American Government. The Roosevelt administration in the last 3 years has made only a feeble gesture. As a result there has naturally grown up among the debtor nations a belief that the United States was reconciled to repudiation and did not really care to collect the debts.

The need to dispel this belief is urgent. The American people are being taxed heavily and the outlook over the next few years is for increased taxes.

Our burdens can be traced for the most part to the World War. It is only fair that money we advanced in good faith, much of it to rebuild Europe, and about which there is a definite agreement and understanding, should be repaid.

These debtor nations find it easy to secure huge sums to add to their naval and military armaments. They find money available for the new war, which is claimed to be around the corner. In the case of England, it is stated they now have a balanced budget.

In view of these facts, I believe the United States should insist upon the meeting of treaty obligations, and if the Roosevelt administration will not take the initiative Congress can do so by the passage of the resolution which I have introduced.

This resolution is a simple reiteration of American rights and a declaration of our belief in the sanctity of international agreements. It is as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States of America that the funded war debts of foreign nations to the United States Government should be paid unequivocally in accordance with the terms of the respective agreements entered into by the debtor nations with the United States Government; and that to this end demand for such payments should be made and insisted upon through diplomatic channels in the interest of good faith among nations and in the name of the peace-loving people of the United States, who bear the burden of such unpaid obligations.

THE OUTLOOK OF FLOOD-RELIEF LEGISLATION

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, the most important problem facing the Pittsburgh district is still flood relief and flood protection.

The emergency nature of this problem is now over. The paramount need is for sound and sure methods of reconstruction and rehabilitation. This is no time for delay. This is the time for plain, outspoken, and vigorous pronouncements.

During the flood and for a few days after the water receded, everyone in the flood areas and in other parts of the United States was in accord that immediate action was necessary to save the victims of the floods and to work out plans for the future prevention of such disasters. The immediate task of relief is being completed in a most admirable way and in an efficient manner.

MERCHANTS NEED FINANCIAL AID

The next question which must be settled is the question of financial aid to the small independent merchants whose businesses are located in the flooded areas, whose merchandise has been destroyed, whose equipment has been badly damaged, and whose assets have been wiped out in many cases.

Machinery to extend financial aid to small merchants must now be set up. Otherwise they will have to retire from business. Their business will be absorbed by the large corporations and their employees will be made jobless.

TALKING ABOUT AID IS NOT ENOUGH

The chamber of commerce, the business and banking leaders of the communities, have all publicly stated again and again that the small merchant is entitled to such aid as is necessary to restore him to the position which he occupied before the flood. With this position I am in complete accord, as I stated in a radio broadcast at Pittsburgh on March 29, 1936, over station WJAS. I also said that I would fight for such assistance in Washington, but I deemed it vital that the local banks should likewise render such financial aid to these deserving merchants as was necessary and proper.

MUST SPEAK THE TRUTH

I maintain that we are not doing the small merchant a service by hiding from him the facts, but that we are hindering and delaying his recovery by holding out false hopes. We owe it to these merchants and we owe it to the community whom they have served to state frankly and openly what the real facts are and what these merchants may expect, so that they may be guided in their action and may take intelligent action for their own salvation.

In order to paint a correct picture we must divide the small merchants into two classes: Those who can give security for loans which may be made to them, and those who have lost their all and are therefore unable to give any security.

LOCAL BANKS DEMAND SECURITY

It appeared to me that a merchant who had dealt for many years with a local bank, who had carried on an honest business in this community, and who had always met his obligations, was entitled to consideration from his banker. So remembering the fact that the local bankers have publicly declared that these small businessmen were entitled to financial aid, I went to some of the banks and inquired whether they were willing to make the necessary loans to their merchant customers. These local bankers told me frankly and without hesitation that if the merchant could put up security—sufficient and adequate security—they would lend him the necessary money. But the local bankers added that if these merchants could not put up security they felt they were not justified to lend the money which belonged to their stockholders or to the depositors, even though they sympathized with the plight of the merchant. In other words, the local bankers admitted the need for aiding the small merchants who had lost their assets, but they declared that it was not sound business practice for them to extend such aid.

With this knowledge, but still determined to do my part to obtain aid for the stricken small businessman, I went back to Washington.

H. R. 11968 FAILS TO RENDER AID

On April 1, 1936, H. R. 11968, the bill to amend and liberalize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the express purpose of aiding property owners and merchants in the flood areas came before the House of Representatives for debate and action. It was widely acclaimed as bringing the necessary aid to the stricken merchants and property owners who were the victims of floods. I am sorry to say that such is not the case. The debate on H. R. 11968 and my own speeches on it will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 1, 1936.

R. F. C. WILL NOT AID DISTRESSED MERCHANTS WHO CANNOT GIVE COLLATERAL SECURITY

As a matter of fact anyone who will read the bill and who will examine and analyze its provisions will see that the bill

will extend aid only to those property owners and merchants who are able to put up adequate security, but that it will be of no help whatsoever to those merchants who have lost their all and thus cannot put up security.

During the debate on this bill I took the floor three times for the purpose of showing by an examination of the bill itself that it would not be of any aid to the merchant who had no security to offer, and in fact that it would harm him by creating hopes which could not be fulfilled.

"WAIVER OF SECURITY" AMENDMENT OFFERED

I hammered away at this point until it was practically admitted. I presented an amendment to the bill which provided for character loans to merchants in the flood areas by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The amendment appears on page 4733 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 1, 1936. It reads as follows:

Provided, however, That in cases where the applicant enjoys a good credit standing and where his past business record shows that the applicant has met his obligations promptly, and that his business ethics are such that he may reasonably be expected to repay such loans, the furnishing of collateral for such part of said loan as applies to personal property may be waived.

This was simple language. It provided that the honest businessman who was solvent before the flood, and who paid his bills in the past and maintained an honorable credit standing, should receive financial assistance from this governmental agency without being required to furnish adequate bank-loan security which he does not have due to the flood damage. Without this amendment the bill passed by the House of Representatives was meaningless and worthless. After prolonged debate, in which many Members of Congress expressed their sympathies for merchants ruined by the flood, my amendment for character loans to honest merchants was defeated.

FEAR GENERAL PRECEDENT

My colleagues in the House who defeated the amendment for character loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation took the position that to extend loans of Government funds to private merchants without sufficient security to guarantee the repayment was undesirable and would create a dangerous precedent. They argued that if that is done in the case of a flood, the same aid must be extended to farmers and merchants who suffer by drought, tornado, earthquake, or other natural disasters. They argued that they were willing to appropriate whatever money is necessary for relief so that no one should starve or go without shelter in the flooded areas, but they felt that they are not justified to lend money to those merchants who lost everything they had in the flooded areas.

I am anxious that these facts be brought to the attention of the merchants concerned. I feel that it is vital that they should know what help they may expect. I feel it is important that these merchants should know exactly what will be done for them so that they could shape their future plans accordingly.

MERCHANTS MAY NOT RECEIVE ASSISTANCE

Therefore I want to make it plain, beyond the peradventure of a doubt, that the fight for character loans for the merchants by the Federal Government has been lost, and that it is not only unlikely but most improbable that such character loans will ever be made. In fact we might say it is certain that they will not be extended. With this knowledge, let us now examine the question whether aid may be expected from other sources, governmental, or a combination of both.

MUST UTILIZE EXISTING AGENCY

It is impossible to set up the machinery for a new agency. One of the requirements in this emergency is speed. It would take almost 2 years to organize properly to grant loans to merchants unless we make use of an existing agency. I believe that the best solution lies in taking advantage of the existing facilities, administrative staff, and experience of the Federal Housing Administration by amending title I, which insures banks and financial institution against losses sustained in making loans to borrowers for repairs and equipment of homes and business properties. Since the primary

need is to help those businessmen who have maintained a favorable credit standing during their past business career, it appears that the banking institution with whom the merchant has been doing business, is in the best position to determine his financial responsibility.

H. R. 11132 AMENDS FEDERAL HOUSING ACT FOR BENEFIT OF FLOOD VICTIMS

I have therefore introduced a bill, H. R. 12132, which amends the Federal Housing Act by permitting the Federal Housing Administration to insure banks and other financial institutions against losses on loans that they may make to merchants whose stocks and equipment were damaged by the flood. It is my proposal that the loans to small merchants be granted to them by their own banks, and as an incentive to the banks to be more liberal with merchant flood victims, the Government will guarantee these loans to the banks up to 20 percent of the total of all the flood loans they may make. In this manner the really deserving and honest merchant will receive liberal credits from his own bank and at the same time not endanger the financial stability of the bank by the granting of unwise loans.

LIBERAL LENDING POLICY MUST BE ADOPTED

However, it is important that the borrowers be assured that the financial institutions whose loans will be insured by the Government will adopt a liberal and humane attitude toward these distressed merchants. I have, therefore specifically provided that the rate of interest shall not exceed 6 percent per annum and that due credit be given for partial payments.

Further provision is made for these loans to mature in about 5 years and that loans for a lesser period be renewed. No loans are to be made for new businesses; they will be limited to finance the replacement of goods and equipment actually damaged or destroyed in the flood.

GOVERNMENT AND LOCAL BANKS TO COOPERATE

In this connection the Government will be doing its part to assist the small merchant. It puts this problem squarely to the banks. Will the local banks cooperate by assuming a liberal attitude toward their merchant depositors or will they, too, insist on adequate and unreasonable margins of security? In the past, recovery was retarded by the ultraconservative policies of some banks. They had refused to extend credit to deserving and solvent businesses. If they maintain the same policies, the merchants of the flood-swept areas will receive no assistance at all. Here is a splendid opportunity for the banks in this district to retrieve lost ground by regaining public confidence. To the extent that the local banks are willing to assume their share of reconstruction and rehabilitation in the Pittsburgh district will be determined the degree of recovery that is to be made by the hard-hit business firms in the Pittsburgh district.

I hope that H. R. 12132, the bill which I just discussed, will be passed by the Congress. If it does, the merchants in the Pittsburgh district and in the other flooded areas may expect substantial assistance by coordinated efforts of the Government and the local financial institutions.

FLOOD-CONTROL BILL TO PASS

And now we come to the prevention of future floods. I should like to emphasize that the omnibus flood-control bill has already passed the House and is now in the Senate Committee on Commerce. We must remind those individuals and organizations who have been urging the passage of this bill that the Members of Congress from this district are all in favor of the construction of flood-control projects.

RIVER WALLS NECESSARY FOR FLOOD PREVENTION

As I explained before, the proposed dams and reservoirs in the headwaters of the Monongahela and Allegheny Rivers would reduce the Pittsburgh flood stage by only 7½ feet. This is wholly inadequate in view of our experience with a 46-foot flood stage. I have pointed out before the necessity of flood walls as a needed additional precaution against a recurrence of a flood disaster.

SUMMARY

I am sorry that this report on the progress of flood-control legislation is not more optimistic, but it is the truth. As

matters stand today in Washington, the chances for the construction of flood-control projects are not certain, and the assistance which it appears will be given flood-stricken business is meager. While this picture is gloomy, the only ray of hope lies in creating sufficient public sentiment for these measures, so that the Members of the House and Senate, who are not from flood-stricken areas, will realize the vital needs of the Pittsburgh district and of other districts damaged by the flood and join with us in passing these necessary bills.

RECORD OF THE ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. UTTERBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made by my colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIERMANN], delivered as temporary chairman at the Democratic State convention of the State of Iowa on April 3, 1936.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. UTTERBACK. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by my colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIERMANN], delivered as temporary chairman of the Democratic State convention of the State of Iowa, April 3, 1936:

Mr. Chairman, I thank you and the other members of the Democratic State central committee for the honor you have conferred upon me. It is a great pleasure to look out onto this splendid audience and to see in the eyes of thoughtful, patriotic men and women pride in the accomplishments of the past 3 years, zeal for this campaign, and confidence in the future of our Republic under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt and a Democratic administration.

The past 3 years have been packed with big events. The program to deal with the wreck and ruin that had overwhelmed this country has been stupendous. It is the simplest kind of justice that the Democratic Party should be judged on that record. We should not be allowed to escape from that record if we would. And we would not if we could. Let us insist that this campaign be fought on that record. Let us not be turned aside. In the words of Abraham Lincoln, "Let us not be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us."

Before we discuss the record, I pay my highest tribute of respect and admiration to those hundreds of thousands of independent voters and Republicans who made the victories of 1932 and 1934 possible. Without them those victories would have been defeats. To sever political ties years old, sometimes generations old, required the noblest kind of patriotism and the finest kind of moral courage. I am reminded of the words of Edmund Burke. They are as true now as they were 150 years ago: "When parties change their principles patriots change their parties." All honor to these men and women who arrayed themselves under the Democratic banner to rescue our country from economic ruin and possible revolution. I earnestly hope that this record which they have made possible has been so pleasing to them that they will abide with us. We have welcomed them to our ranks and to our councils. With their continued aid the great program for economic and social justice can be carried forward to triumphant conclusion.

The humanitarian purposes that have inspired much of the Roosevelt activities have made special appeal to the hearts and minds of the women of America. They have seen and have applauded the purpose to rescue the unfortunate, to provide wholesome surroundings for children and young people, and altogether to make America a better place in which to live and in which to rear families. We ask the womanhood of America to continue its support in order that humanitarian progress may not be arrested by those who contend that the improvement of American home surroundings is not a proper subject for Federal legislation.

And I cannot help but compliment another group that has contributed greatly to the victories—the Young Democratic Clubs. They have directed the attention of young people to their duty to take a thoughtful interest and a patriotic part in politics. The young Democrats have done valiant service for the great program we call the New Deal. The courage, the directness, and the frankness of the New Deal appeal to young people, unfettered by years of political habit. The young Democrats have come into political activity as the supporters of great ideals. I pray them that they continue during their lives to be devoted to high ideals of politics and of government. In a short time the destiny of the Democratic Party will be in their charge. May they keep it loyal and true to great principles of government. May they keep it free from domination by selfish groups on the one hand and by mobs led by clever demagogues on the other.

And now for the record, on which this election should turn. In considering that record we ask the public to have in mind three questions: (1) What was the situation that confronted this administration March 4, 1933; (2) what have we done to meet that situation; and (3) what will our critics undo if they return to power?

BANKING

In the 12 Republican years ending March 4, 1933, more than 10,000 banks had failed in the United States. In 1 year alone

2,294 closed their doors. Our banking system had collapsed and had carried with it the life savings of millions of Americans, many of whom are today in want through no fault of their own. The banking collapse had wrecked thousands of business men. Commercial credit had dried up and confidence in banks had ceased to exist. Financial anarchy prevailed.

The first official act of the Roosevelt administration was to close all the banks in the country until they could reopen with good assurance that they would stay open. The activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation were promptly expanded, and from March 1933 to February 1936 the R. F. C. assisted banks with loans of \$6,531,956,374. The Emergency Banking Act of 1933 and the Banking Act of 1935 put the banking system of the United States onto the soundest basis in its history. That fact is attested by the banks' repayment already of \$2,965,621,228 of the loans advanced to them since March 1933.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was organized. It was the first effort ever made by our Government to protect the savings of the American people. Its success is shown in an increase of \$6,000,000,000 in the bank deposits of our country and in the now universal confidence in our banks.

These acts are monuments to the sound business policies of this administration. Their value to bankers, to depositors, and to the business people of our country cannot be measured.

We challenge our critics to name one of our banking laws which they would repeal. We challenge comparison of these 3 years of Democratic rule with the last 12 years of Republican rule as they have affected the banking situation in America.

INVESTMENTS

For many years the fraudulent sale of stocks and bonds had gone on unrestrained by the Republican administrations. No Iowa community escaped the ravages of these grafters who bilked our citizens of their savings. Few Iowa banks escaped the purchase of worthless stocks and bonds, whose purchase was oftentimes encouraged or even demanded by the State banking department or the national banking department under Republican administration. The Roosevelt administration gave the country the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, which have put an end to these exploitations and have curbed fraudulent manipulations of the stock exchanges. Have these antistealing laws hurt honest business? Let the record answer. In the first 9 months of 1935 more than twice as many dollars of new securities were issued as during the entire year 1932. The Roosevelt administration is the friend of honest business. It is the enemy of fraudulent business and purposes to continue to be.

Which of these antigraft acts would our critics repeal?

COMMERCIAL FAILURES

There appears to be a Nation-wide propaganda to scare business. The scare cannot be founded on facts. I say to you that there is not one kind of legitimate business in this Republic that has not been improved by the acts of this Democratic administration. The record shows it beyond cavil. In 1932 there were 31,822 commercial failures in the United States. In 1935 there were only 12,185. Every daily newspaper tells of increased earnings and of bigger and better business. I ask any businessman in Iowa if he would exchange 1936 business conditions for those of 1932.

FOREIGN TRADE

Every sound thinker knows that America can never have the fullest employment of labor, the greatest business activity, nor the fullest measure of farm prosperity until our foreign trade has been restored. That trade was wrecked by the narrow, restrictive policies of preceding administrations and by the utter stupidity of that criminal folly, the Hawley-Smoot tariff of 1930. In 1929 our foreign trade was \$9,500,000,000. In 1932 it was only \$3,100,000,000. Thomas Lamont, President Hoover's Secretary of Commerce, said that the loss of that \$6,400,000,000 of foreign business caused the unemployment of more than 3,000,000 American workers. Those 3,000,000 unemployed, with their families, became poor customers for Iowa ham, bacon, pork chops, beefsteak, and butter. Their decreased consumption contributed substantially to cause the surpluses that wrecked the prices of Iowa farm products.

The rebuilding of foreign trade is a slow and laborious process, but it is going on successfully. In 1935 it was \$1,180,633,142 more than it was in the last year of the Hoover administration. Would our critics destroy that increased business and throw out of work those engaged in it?

A few years ago foreign countries used to buy from us, in pork and lard, the equivalent of 17,000,000 hogs annually. In 1932 their purchases had been reduced to the equivalent of 3,000,000 hogs. The Roosevelt administration purposes to restore as much of that business as possible. Trade agreements have been made with a number of countries that will eventually greatly expand the foreign consumption of American farm products. The agreement with Switzerland is typical, both of the situation that confronted us and of the remedy applied. Switzerland used to buy 90 percent of her lard from the United States. Exasperated by the Hawley-Smoot tariff, Switzerland had ceased to buy a single pound of American lard. Under the recent agreement she agrees to buy again 90 percent of her lard from us.

PEACE

The American people want peace. They abhor the barbarity of war and the stupidity of attempting to settle international difficulties with wholesale slaughter. This administration wants peace. It has announced the policy of the "good neighbor", and it is practicing that policy. It has taken effective measures to link

together the peace-loving peoples of the North and South American Continents. The Congress has passed neutrality laws to keep us out of entanglement in future conflicts. The State Department has achieved great success among great difficulties in its efforts to improve our relations with many countries. It is pressing for economic stability as the surest basis for peace. But let us not deceive ourselves. The question of our entrance into another war, if one comes, is going to be decided by the American people themselves. Let us dedicate America to peace. Let us have peace at home, and let us contribute to peace abroad. And let us determine now that if war comes in Europe we shall stay out of it, even though the price we shall have to pay may be the utmost hard times and the most costly dislocation of our economic system.

HOME LOANS

Through all the efforts of this administration may be seen as a principal purpose the desire to help the mass of our citizens, the average man and woman.

Loans to home owners are an example. Hundreds of thousands of American home owners, thrown out of work by the hard times of the Republican administrations, or reduced in circumstances by investment in fraudulent stocks and bonds, were about to lose their homes when this administration came into power. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation was created to help them. In the 30 months since its creation it has made loans to more than a million borrowers, most of whom otherwise would have lost their homes by foreclosure. Among these million borrowers foreclosure has been taken against less than one-third of 1 percent. Not only did the home owners themselves benefit by this program but the State, county, and municipal governments have benefited to the extent of more than \$225,000,000 in delinquent taxes, which were paid in these transactions. Iowa home owners have more than 19,000 of these loans, amounting to more than \$37,000,000.

The Federal Housing Act has supplemented the H. O. L. C. and has created business and employment in every county in Iowa. It was passed in the summer of 1934. Its benefits are indicated by the fact that building permits for residences in the last 3 months of 1935 increased 250 percent over the last 3 months of 1934.

What fault do our critics find with that program? Was it wrong to save the homes of a million American families?

SOCIAL SECURITY

We have enacted railroad-pension legislation that heretofore couldn't even get a hearing in Congress. No other administration in all history has dealt with the problems of labor with as much sympathy as has been given to them the past 3 years. We have insisted that, so far as the national laws can affect the situation, labor must have good working conditions, reasonable hours, and fair pay.

In 1935 we passed the Social Security Act. Under it the Federal Government gives aid to the dependent aged, the blind, dependent children, maternal and child welfare, public-welfare service, and vocational rehabilitation. Under it a system of unemployment insurance is set up, providing for contributions by employer and employee to lay something aside against the rainy day of unemployment and old age.

Some say we have not gone far enough. To them we answer that no other government in all the world has ever attempted so much at one time.

Others say that this is socialism or communism. To them we answer, "If this be socialism or communism, so is the Sermon on the Mount, for the principles involved are identical."

RELIEF

The problem of more than 14,000,000 unemployed confronted this administration 3 years ago. To combat it, Nation-wide agencies had to be set up in a hurry. They had no experience to guide them. They entered a new and unexplored field of Federal activity. Errors in policy and mistakes in spending were inevitable.

Improved business conditions the past 3 years have given employment to at least 5,000,000 persons, but there are still millions of persons unemployed. Probably the unemployed will be with us for years to come. One modern invention after another makes it possible for a few people to do the work that formerly required many persons. Today Government agencies are supplying work for 3,800,000 persons. Local and State relief are caring for 1,500,000. Each succeeding year of the Roosevelt administration the problem has been dealt with more efficiently and more economically, and the appropriation for next year's relief will be the lowest in 4 years.

AID TO YOUTH

One of the tragedies of the depression was the unemployed young people. Reaching working ages, there was nothing for them to do, and adverse circumstances compelled them to languish in idleness. We established the C. C. C. camps, which have furnished wholesome employment to hundreds of thousands of young men and war veterans, who have contributed \$25 each per month to the support of their dependents. Such a program had never been dreamed of by any administration before this one.

We have extended aid to needy and deserving young people who desire to continue their education. More than 103,000 such students have been given aid at one time.

NO SCANDAL IN WASHINGTON

There has been no scandal or suspicion of scandal in Washington in these crowded years. They have criticized the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, for his administration of the P. W. A., but his bitterest enemies have admitted his honesty. They have denounced

Harry Hopkins, but they have never accused him of stealing. Not so long ago another administration had a Secretary of the Interior, Albert Fall, who was sent to the penitentiary for attempting to steal the Nation's birthright. There has been no Fall or Forbes or Daugherty or Jesse Smith or Gaston Means in the Roosevelt administration. There have been mistakes, but they have been honest mistakes.

AGRICULTURE

Am I at all inaccurate when I say that the Republican Party has never done anything effective for the good of Iowa agriculture? It has crucified agriculture on the cross of the high so-called protective tariff. When the administration of President Harding took over the Government from a Democratic administration agriculture was at the peak of its prosperity. During the succeeding 12 years of the Republican administrations it was reduced step by step to the lowest depths of adversity. In those 12 years three tariff laws were passed, each one higher than its predecessor. Each higher tariff law was followed quickly with lower farm prices; and each higher tariff was followed in some cases by higher prices on the things the farmer had to buy. Each tariff caused retaliation by foreign countries, which contracted and finally almost destroyed the foreign market in which the farmers of America disposed of their surplus products. Finally, after the most monstrous of all tariffs, the Hawley-Smoot tariff, the farmers' surplus stayed at home and the result was 2-cent hogs and 8-cent corn.

History will record that no other administration ever acted so earnestly, so effectively, in the farmers' behalf as has this very Roosevelt administration.

On March 4, 1933, two and a half million American farms were mortgaged. Five hundred thousand of them were in imminent danger of foreclosure. The Federal land bank, set up by the last Democratic administration, had ceased to function. In 1932, when it was most needed, it loaned only \$27,000,000 in the entire United States.

What did we do about that situation? We promptly expanded the activities of the Federal land banks. Their rates of 5 percent and 6 percent were lowered to 4½ percent, 4¼ percent, and for this current year to 3½ percent. There is no similar type of loan made by any other government land bank in all the world at so low a rate of interest. In 1932, the last Hoover year, at interest rates then prevailing and at prices then prevailing, it took 2,174 bushels of corn or seventy 220-pound hogs to pay the interest on a \$10,000 Federal land-bank loan. In 1935, at interest rates then prevailing and at prices then prevailing, it took 425 bushels of corn or nineteen 220-pound hogs to do the same thing.

There were outstanding in Iowa on March 7, 1936, 51,507 Government loans, and they total \$257,443,500. That is an average for each Iowa county of more than 500 loans and more than two and one-quarter million dollars. Of this tremendous sum, four-fifths was advanced since the Roosevelt administration came into power. I ask you from your own experience, since the dark days of 1932, how many Iowa farmers would have been dispossessed of their homes if the Roosevelt administration had not come into power? If the Federal land banks had loaned only \$27,000,000 in 1933 and only \$27,000,000 in 1934, how many thousands of Iowa farmers would have been foreclosed?

Not only has this administration made real-estate loans at the lowest rate in the world but it provided money at low rates for seed and feed and for the ordinary production processes on the farm. It has provided money for farm cooperatives at low rates.

CORN LOANS

Not so many years ago, when corn reached a very low figure, the Republican Secretary of Agriculture offered as his cure for the situation that Iowa farmers burn their corn for fuel. In the fall of 1932 thousands of bushels of Iowa corn were sold for 7 and 8 cents a bushel. This Democratic administration had not been in power long until it was lending farmers 45 cents a bushel on their corn, sealed in their own cribs and kept on their own farms.

Permit me to recall an instance. In 1933, when corn was selling at 20 cents a bushel, a Cerro Gordo County farmer, with bills to pay and supplies for his family to buy, had 1,600 bushels of corn in his crib. If he had sold it at 20 cents a bushel he would have received \$320, and he would have had only \$320 with which to pay the merchant and the doctor and the dentist and to buy from the businessmen of his community. But the Government loaned him 45 cents a bushel on his corn, in his own crib, on his own farm. Then he had \$720 with which to pay his obligation and to trade with his merchants. When he came to sell his corn, he received 70 cents a bushel, or \$1,120. This one Iowa farmer on one transaction with the Roosevelt administration had made \$800. And not only had he profited but the business and professional men of his community had profited. Multiply that instance by thousands and you have a picture of the benefit this administration's corn loans conferred upon Iowa farmers and upon Iowa business and professional people.

In 1933 the corn farmers of this country borrowed \$120,664,190.24 at 45 cents a bushel. Every cent of that money has been repaid. In 1934 they borrowed \$4,323,884.68 at 55 cents a bushel. Every cent of that has been repaid. Never in American history has there been another administration that has done that sort of practical thing for Iowa farmers.

The Roosevelt administration was confronted with two agricultural problems: First, to provide credit in a hurry at low rates of interest. That was done efficiently and successfully. The second problem was to raise the prices of farm commodities. That was the job on which the Hoover Farm Board had failed so miserably and had squandered a half billion dollars.

No action by individual farmers, no action by individual States could hope to deal with the problem of overproduction of farm products. Only the National Government could provide the necessary national plan for united action. That was done in the Agricultural Adjustment Act. You know of its success, but let me remind you of some of the official figures. On March 15, 1933, the average price received by Iowa farmers for corn was 13 cents a bushel; for hogs, \$3.20 a hundredweight; for butter, 17 cents a pound; for eggs, 8½ cents a dozen. On December 15, 1935, they received 46 cents for corn, \$8.80 for hogs, 33 cents for butter, and 26 cents for eggs.

The A. A. A. proposed to do for the farmers what any factory would have done for itself in the face of a declining market; it restricted the production to fit the demand. But not only did the administration give the farmers a plan for business-like curtailment of production, but by putting people to work and improving business it expanded home consumption. The result has been that in less than 3 years the American farmers have been advanced from the depths of depression a long way on their road back to the prosperity which they deserve.

Up until December 31, 1935, Iowa farmers had received in benefit payments the stupendous sum of \$93,292,030.60. That was spending Government money in Iowa, for Iowans, where Iowans could see it.

The Supreme Court invalidated the A. A. A. Congress promptly appropriated money to finish the payments still due on the 1935 contracts. More than \$22,000,000 will yet be paid to Iowa farmers out of that appropriation.

But the benefit payments made to reward farmers who reduced their production and thereby made the A. A. A. program possible—those were, by far, the smaller part of the farmers' gain. Their principal gain was the increase in the prices of the products they sold. In the last year of the Wilson administration the total gross income of American farmers was \$13,600,000,000. In the last year of the Hoover administration it had fallen to \$5,300,000,000. That difference of \$8,300,000,000 meant the ruin of hundreds of thousands of American farmers, the foreclosure of tens of thousands of American farms, while the Hoover administration did not one effective thing to avert the catastrophe or to rescue its victims. That difference of \$8,000,000,000 in the farmers' income ruined thousands of businessmen in cities and towns such as we have in Iowa, whose prosperity rises and falls precisely with that of farmers.

By 1935 the gross income of American farmers, which had sunk to \$5,300,000,000 under Hoover, had risen to \$8,110,000,000 under Franklin D. Roosevelt. The farmer has money again. The merchant and the lawyer, the doctor and the dentist, who had sunk into the mire with the farmers, they, too, have money and the best business in many years. Is this administration dangerous to business? Let the record of business the past 3 years in any town in Iowa answer that question.

SOIL CONSERVATION ACT

Your Congress has devised a successor to the A. A. A., the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. In that program farm land will be taken out of production of crops and put into production of fertility. In administering that program it is hoped and believed that ruinous farm surpluses will be avoided. Its enactment again demonstrates that this administration has the welfare of agriculture as its principal concern.

In 1932 I stated scores of times that not one farmer in the Fourth Iowa District would make a single dollar that year, figuring his investment and overhead. That statement has never been called into question to this day, so far as I know. Today farmers are making money in every county in Iowa. Iowa business and professional men are making money, because the Roosevelt policies have made it possible for their farmer customers to bring cash into the cities and towns of this State. At last Iowa farmers have a place in the sun and they are going to keep it, so long as this administration is in power. And we have confidence, so far as Iowa is concerned, that the farmers are going to see to it that the Roosevelt administration continues in power.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

They say that we have spent too much money. One reason why that appeals to us Iowans is that we were not used to seeing the Federal Government spend money in Iowa. We have been content with reading about expenditures on the Atlantic seaboard. In the past 3 years, for the first time, Iowans have seen the Federal Government spend money in Iowa for the good of Iowans.

The World War increased our debt \$24,000,000,000. Did anyone say it was costing too much to kill people in 1917 and 1918? Did anyone say, "We must stop killing people because it is too expensive"? No; the universal cry was that we should continue in the killing business, regardless of cost, until we had killed enough to win the victory.

During the past 3 years we have been engaged in a great war on a hundred economic fronts. We have been engaged in a great war not only to rescue 130,000,000 people from the depths of depression, but we have been engaged in a gigantic struggle to destroy the causes of these disasters, lest they again bring us economic wreck and ruin at some future date. In this great peacetime struggle we have increased the public debt not twenty-four billion but nine billion.

The Hoover administration increased the public debt five and one-half billion. In those disastrous 4 years, while the debt was increasing five and one-half billion, the wealth of the Nation

decreased one hundred and fourteen billion—and more than twenty billion of it was in the value of American farms. The Hoover administration increased the public debt five and one-half billion, and in 1932 the annual income of the American people was fifty-one billion less than it was the year Mr. Hoover took office.

We have increased the public debt nine billion, but the wealth of the Nation has increased \$50,000,000,000 since Roosevelt took office. In 1935 the income of the American people was fifteen billion dollars more than it was the last year of the Hoover administration. Judged by the results, which expenditure of public money was good business—that by the Hoover administration or that by the Roosevelt administration?

PRESERVING THE REPUBLIC

The Liberty League and the Du Ponts and others of their turn of mind charge that this Democratic administration has conspired to change our form of government. To get a rational view of that charge, let us look a little at American history. Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party, wrote the Declaration of Independence, which is the cornerstone of the philosophy upon which our form of government was built. Another Democrat, James Madison, wrote the Constitution of the United States, about which the Liberty Leaguers are so concerned now, though 3 short years ago some of them declared it should be put into cold storage. Another Democrat, James Monroe, promulgated the Monroe Doctrine, which has preserved our form of government inviolate on the two American continents for more than a hundred years. A little more history: Every foot of ground that has been added to the Thirteen Original States between the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific and between Canada and Mexico was added by some Democratic administration and put under our form of government. Our form of government in danger from a Democratic administration? Who gave us our form of government? Who preserved it from selfish interests and from demagogues? Call the roll of the Democratic architects and defenders of our form of government—Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Andrew Jackson, Samuel J. Tilden, Grover Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. If in some evil day some political party attempts to change our form of government or to undermine our Republic's greatness, it will be some party that has had far less to its credit in founding and in preserving this Government and far less in making this Nation great than has the historic party of the plain people, the great Democratic Party.

On March 4, 1933, the faith of the American people in our form of government had been severely tried. Some had lost faith. Some men, who now invoke the Constitution, declared that America needed a dictator. The Roosevelt administration has restored the American people's faith in our form of government. It has silenced the cry for a dictator. It has proved to our Nation and to the world that a republic can survive an economic cataclysm, "and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

IN THE SPIRIT OF FAIR PLAY

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on a bill introduced by me last Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of fair play I introduced H. R. 12243, a bill to correct a discrimination against certain cities and counties which borrowed for relief purposes from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under title I of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932. This bill is designed to release such cities and counties from the obligation to repay these loans, which loans were made for the same purposes that similar loans were made to States, and which latter loans have been canceled, in excess of the sum of two hundred and eighty millions. The city of Detroit is vitally interested, and from the conference of mayors I am assured that other political subdivisions of government, which will be affected by the passage of this bill, are also most keenly interested. As I said in the beginning, the bill is introduced solely in the spirit of fair play.

STATEMENT OF FACTS REGARDING R. F. C. LOANS TO CITIES AND COUNTIES UNDER THE EMERGENCY RELIEF AND CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1932

The Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932—Public, No. 302, Seventy-second Congress, approved July 21, 1932—authorized the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, first, to make \$300,000,000 available for loans to States and cities for the relief of destitution; and second, to make loans or contracts up to \$1,500,000,000 to finance self-liquidating public-works projects in States and municipalities.

This act represented the first participation, on the part of the Federal Government, in the relief and unemployment picture—first, by making loans to States, counties, and cities for direct relief purposes, and second, by providing the funds, on a loan basis, to stimulate employment through a public-works program.

Two alternative procedures for obtaining relief loans were provided for in the act itself. On the one hand, a State might secure a Federal advance by having the Governor make an application in which he showed the need for relief funds and the State's lack of resources. These loans were to be repaid out of future road grants to the State.

According to section 1 (b) of the act, repayment would be accomplished in such cases—

By making annual deductions beginning with the fiscal year 1935 from regular apportionments made from future Federal authorizations in aid of the States and Territories for the construction of highways and rural post roads, of an amount equal to one-fifth of the share which such State or Territory would be entitled to receive under such apportionment, * * * or an amount equal to one-fifth of the amounts so paid to the Governor of such State or Territory pursuant to this section, whichever is the lesser, until the sum of such deductions equals the total amounts paid under this section and all accrued interest thereon.

On the other hand, loans might be made direct to cities and counties, through the Governor, if secured by evidences of indebtedness on the part of the political subdivisions. Repayment in such cases would be subject to interest at the rate of 3 percent per year, and according to such terms as the Corporation and the municipality or county might agree upon.

Any portion of the amount approved by the Corporation for payment to the Governor of a State or Territory shall, at his request, and with the approval of the Corporation, be paid to any municipality or political subdivision of such State or Territory if (1) the Governor makes as to such municipality or political subdivision a like certificate as provided in subsection (c) as to the State or Territory, and (2) such municipality or political subdivision enters into an agreement with the Corporation for the repayment to the Corporation of the amount so paid, with interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum, at such times, and upon such other terms and conditions, as may be agreed upon between the Corporation and such municipality or political subdivision. The amount paid to any municipality or political subdivision under this subsection shall not be included in any amounts reimbursable to the Corporation under subsection (b) of this section. (Subsection (e), sec. 1, title I, Public, No. 302, 72d Cong.)

The sums lent to cities and counties were to be a direct obligation of the cities and counties and not payable by deductions from State highway grants as were the loans to States, although both loans were for the same purpose; namely, relief.

When the new administration took office on March 4, 1933, almost every State in the Union had been an applicant for relief loans for itself or for its counties or cities, and the \$300,000,000 fund was practically exhausted. By the "close of business" as provided under title I, which took place May 29, 1933, 42 States and 2 Territories—Hawaii and Puerto Rico—had been recipients of relief loans from the Corporation. Approximately \$3,500,000 had been lent to cities in the States of Michigan, North Dakota, and Ohio and sixteen millions to counties in the States of Illinois, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, and Washington, making a total of nearly twenty millions advanced to local governments. By the middle of October 1935, the R. F. C. had recovered \$538,000 on these loans to municipalities, chiefly through the sale of city obligations to private buyers.

Now, the important aspect of these relief loans from the R. F. C. \$300,000,000 fund is that in effect the loans made to the States have been canceled, while the loans made to the cities and counties remain binding obligations upon these local governments which were forced to borrow to meet relief needs. Section 14 of Public, No. 393, Seventy-third Congress, wiped out advances to the States and converted such advances into straight grants. This section provided that—

No deductions shall hereafter be made on account of prior advances and/or loans to the States for the construction of roads under the requirements of the Federal Highway Act or on account of amounts paid under the provisions of title I of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 for furnishing relief and work relief to needy and distressed people.

This means that the Government has canceled probably two hundred and eighty millions advanced to the States but is requiring three and one-half millions advanced to the cities to be repaid, as well as the sixteen millions advanced to the counties. It is realized that nineteen and one-half millions

is not a tremendous sum, but to the particular cities and counties concerned the sums involved are important when these communities are continuing to face a tremendous relief burden.

No reason has yet been advanced for the above discrimination in favor of the States. Why States should be permitted to have their loans canceled while the borrowing cities and counties must repay the loans made seems on the face of it a policy so unjust as to warrant immediate congressional action.

The question is, On what basis does the Federal Government convert \$280,000,000 of loans to States into outright grants and yet at the same time hold 32 local political subdivisions of these same States to the obligation to repay approximately nineteen and one-half millions?

The cities and counties are not desirous of evading any responsibility to the Federal Government, but they do object to being discriminated against. They must be treated on the same basis as the State governments.

R. F. C. loans to cities and counties for relief made under authority of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 (sec. 1, subsec. (e), of title I), which obligations this bill seeks to cancel

CITIES	
Michigan:	
Detroit	\$1,800,000
Flint	296,000
Muskegon Heights	20,000
Ohio:	
Alliance	31,500
Canton	150,000
Cuyahoga Falls	18,000
Cleveland	760,000
Dayton	322,000
Niles	19,816
Warren	57,000
North Dakota: Minot	10,000
COUNTIES	
Illinois:	
Cook	\$12,252,000
Ohio:	
Cuyahoga	470,000
Lorain	131,245
Mahoning	326,440
Montgomery	482,000
Stark	334,900
Summit	240,500
Trumbull	177,500
Washington:	
Grays Harbor	105,000
Kings	675,000
Pierce	190,000
Snohomish	105,000
New York:	
Nassau	200,000
North Dakota:	
Bowman	10,000
Burke	4,500
Burleigh	6,160
Divide	8,100
Mercer	7,700
Mountrail	4,000
Ward	7,120
Williams	40,000
	13,100

Under title I of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, the following States borrowed funds from the R. F. C. for relief purposes:

Alabama	\$4,211,688
Arizona	1,448,269
Arkansas	4,833,967
California	10,081,631
Colorado	3,832,990
Florida	3,886,512
Georgia	1,745,692
Idaho	1,026,566
Illinois	43,191,721
Indiana	5,179,931
Iowa	2,151,430
Kansas	2,592,934
Kentucky	6,728,987
Louisiana	8,200,127
Maine	252,895
Maryland	176,380
Michigan	19,692,199
Minnesota	2,581,787
Mississippi	4,058,919
Missouri	4,616,789
Montana	2,368,285
Nevada	262,632

New Hampshire	\$1,366,603
New Jersey	2,009,291
New Mexico	387,903
New York	26,400,000
North Carolina	5,950,000
North Dakota	492,088
Ohio	15,721,304
Oklahoma	4,570,597
Oregon	2,798,290
Pennsylvania	34,929,875
Rhode Island	1,123,590
South Carolina	4,575,270
South Dakota	1,803,945
Tennessee	3,375,352
Texas	7,952,291
Utah	2,923,439
Virginia	4,902,430
Washington	5,977,430
West Virginia	9,655,218
Wisconsin	12,395,362

Under the law these loans were to be repaid out of future Federal highway grants to the State. However, under section 14 of Public, No. 393, Seventy-third Congress, the above loans have been wiped out and converted into straight grants. The total thus canceled amounts to approximately two hundred and eighty millions.

In view of the above facts, the cities and counties acting in the emergency to furnish relief and work relief to the needy and distressed should be entitled to the same consideration as has been accorded to the States.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I present a privileged report providing for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 230.

The resolution is as follows:

House Resolution 485 (Rept. No. 2395)

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 230, a Senate joint resolution amending paragraph (4) of subsection (n) of section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

The resolution was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

LET'S EXAMINE RECORD OF ROOSEVELT AND CONGRESS—SUMMARY OF NEW DEAL PROGRESS

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the record of President Roosevelt and Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to participate in the humanitarian and progressive program of President Roosevelt. This history-making epoch has been stirring and inspiring. I submit a brief review of part of the achievements of the New Deal.

RELIEF FOR MEN, HOMES, AND BUSINESS

1. The Roosevelt administration has provided food for the hungry, milk for babes, and work for nearly 4,000,000 unemployed.

2. Congress has appropriated \$3,300,000,000 and \$4,880,000,000 for relief and recovery, and has under consideration a further appropriation of \$1,500,000,000. Roosevelt has allocated California \$275,646,884 for relief, \$2 for one contributed by our State. California ranks third in appropriations received for relief.

3. The Emergency Banking Act rescued the banks of this country from bankruptcy. Roosevelt inherited a deficit of \$5,438,458,311 from the Hoover administration. The unhappy and forgetful Herbert potted his chickens around the corner before they hatched.

4. Banks were reorganized and financially strengthened. Railroad, insurance, investment, building and loan companies, and industries were saved from ruin.

5. The Home Owners Loan Corporation saved approximately a million homes from foreclosure. The Government loans amounted to around \$3,000,000,000, and 500,000 farms were saved by loans amounting to \$2,000,000,000.

6. The C. C. C.—Civilian Conservation Corps—rehabilitated a half million young men who were tramping the streets and highways. From their pay of \$30 per month, \$25 per month was assigned to a mother, father, or other dependents.

7. The National Youth Movement has kept 289,000 young men and women in our high schools, colleges, and universities.

RECOVERY AND RECONSTRUCTION

8. The P. W. A.—Public Works Administration—has afforded employment for millions and aided in the construction of highways, bridges, courthouses, schoolhouses, sewers, storm drains, parks, playgrounds, municipal utilities, and public improvements of every kind and character.

9. Government agencies financed the power line from Boulder Dam to Los Angeles; the metropolitan aqueduct from the Colorado River; the All-American Canal in the Imperial Valley; the San Francisco Bay bridges, the Central Valley project, highways, and other projects.

10. Examples of recovery are found on every hand. Bank deposits are the highest in the history of this country. Automobile production has increased 189 percent.

LABOR AND THE WORKER

11. The N. R. A.—the National Recovery Act—which has been nullified by the Supreme Court, was the most helpful labor legislation ever enacted in this country. It increased wages and reduced hours in many industries, particularly in the cotton mills and coal mines where wages were wretched. The N. R. A. abolished child labor. Since the Supreme Court decision the employment of children of the ages of 14 and 15 increased 55 percent in 7 months, as compared with the entire year 1934 under the N. R. A. The N. R. A. legalized collective bargaining and recognized organized labor.

12. The National Labor Relations Board also recognizes the right of labor to organize and to bargain collectively. It provides machinery for settling disputes to protect the worker, the employer, and the public from disastrous strikes.

13. Congress has enacted a law establishing employment agencies throughout the Nation to help the unemployed and to protect them from racketeering employment bureaus.

14. The Guffey bill protects coal miners in hours and wages.

15. Roosevelt and Congress provided the present Railway Arbitration Act.

16. A retirement and pension system for railway workers to take the place of a previous law declared unconstitutional.

17. The United States entered the International Labor Organization at Geneva, Switzerland, an organization for the purpose of increasing wages, reducing hours, the introduction of safety measures, the protection of mothers and children throughout the world.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS AND SOCIAL SECURITY

18. Under the leadership of President Roosevelt Congress passed a social-security bill. The Federal Government will match the old-age pension of the States, dollar for dollar, up to \$15 a month at the age limit of 65 years and also provides for the needy blind. It is estimated that California will benefit a million dollars monthly by complying with the Social Security Act. It will help many old folks.

19. The Social Security Act aids mothers' pensions and contributes one-third of the total expenditures up to \$18 a month for one child and to \$12 a month for each additional child in the home. It aids widows and orphans.

20. The Social Security Act provides an appropriation of \$3,800,000 a year to cooperating States for the Children's Bureau for mother-child health projects, treatment for crippled children, and vocational teaching for the handicapped.

21. The Social Security Act provides an appropriation of \$8,000,000 per year to the States for public health.

22. The Social Security Act sets up a workers' annuity plan under Federal control. To illustrate: A young man of 35, beginning in 1937, after 30 years of service, at 65, will receive a monthly pension of \$42.50 if his average monthly wage is \$100. Under this plan he will have contributed \$900 during his 30 years of employment, but if he lives out a normal life, he will receive \$5,100 in benefits.

23. The Social Security Act provides for unemployment insurance. It is estimated that it will pay the worker half his usual wages up to \$15 per week for a period of from 15 to 16 weeks each year.

ROOSEVELT AIDS THE FARMER

24. The A. A. A., declared unconstitutional, increased the farmers' income \$3,000,000,000, but big boys, including Hoover's son, got too much.

25. A new agricultural bill has been enacted by Congress, providing for soil conservation and royalties by which the farmer who complies will receive limited compensation.

26. Federal land banks assist farmers in refinancing, extending the term of the loan over a period of years at a lower interest than heretofore; also cooperative banks to extend credit to farmer cooperatives to assist them in marketing and buying. Other aids provide the farmer with seed for planting and crop credits.

HOUSING AND HOMESTEADS

27. In addition to the H. O. L. C., the F. H. A.—the Federal Housing Administration—has aided in the modernization of homes.

28. Subsistence homesteads, garden homes, are sold on easy terms at a low rate of interest to workers who have only part-time employment. Live and help live.

29. The Resettlement Administration aids farmers living on worn-out lands to obtain areas that are productive of a decent livelihood.

30. Reforestation and national parks, prevention of erosion, control of floods, development of navigation, reclamation, irrigation, and drainage are all important features of conservation and national planning.

MONEY AND BANKING

31. This administration has abrogated gold contracts and denies the unfair privilege of the money lender who gives a check on a bank to demand the payment of interest and principal in gold coin.

32. The gold content of the dollar has been reduced to 59 cents to help restore the purchasing price of the dollar to the 1926 level. This enables the borrower to pay in dollars with the same purchasing value that he received. The appreciation of the gold dollar has been disastrous to millions of borrowers. Gold fluctuations upset business.

33. All money—gold, silver, greenbacks, Treasury and bank notes—is now a full legal tender in payment of all debts, both public and private. This is one of the important steps in financial legislation in our history.

34. The dollar of today is approaching a managed dollar basis in order to give the buyer and seller, worker and employer, borrower and lender, an honest dollar of uniform purchasing value.

35. Guaranty of deposits has restored confidence in banks. There were 11,118 bank failures under Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover and only 36 since with insured deposits. William J. Bryan was jeered for advocating this beneficial program.

36. The Government control of the Federal Reserve banks has been strengthened. The Reserve Bank of New York no longer dominates the other 11 Reserve centers, and the financial capital of the United States has been removed from Wall Street back to Washington. Applaud this.

37. Federal credit unions have been authorized and permits the organization of lending cooperatives and frees borrowers from the clutches of the loan shark. It is good.

38. The Export-Import Bank promotes foreign trade.

39. The price and use of silver has been augmented and stabilized by the requirement that the Treasury reserve shall be 25 percent silver and 75 percent gold.

40. The national debt has been refunded at lower interest, saving the taxpayers millions of dollars per year.

STOCK EXCHANGES AND UTILITIES

41. Stock exchanges have been placed under regulation to curb "the shearing of the lamb", a favorite Wall Street sport.

42. The Wheeler-Rayburn law to curb utility racketeers. Millions were spent to defeat this measure.

43. The T. V. A.—the Tennessee Valley Authority—is a Government agency to operate the Muscle Shoals Dam and power plant. Rates have been reduced one-half and in some instances to one-third to consumers. Senator NORRIS fought for it.

44. The T. V. A. has been authorized to build other dams, improve navigation, control floods, produce light and power, manufacture fertilizer, reforestation, and prevent erosion. It is the first attempt on a large scale to carry out national planning. It is building a new South.

45. The Electric Home and Farm Authority enables the consumers to purchase refrigerators, washing machines, and other electrical appliances at reduced prices on an installment plan, and is of benefit to the consumer, worker, merchant, and manufacturer.

46. The R. E. A. recently passed to aid farmers in the construction of transmission lines in order to enjoy light and power.

47. The F. C. C.—the Federal Communications Commission—has been given supervision and control over telegraphs, telephones, and radio in order to protect the public from many long-standing abuses.

VETERANS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

48. Congress has provided for the payment of the adjusted-service certificates, the "bonus", a debt to the veterans of the World War. The President vetoed but Congress repassed this measure.

49. Pensions of the Spanish War veterans were restored to approximately \$45,000,000 per year; the veterans of the Philippine Insurrection were voted travel pay by the House.

50. The reception of the "bonus army" under the humanitarian policy of President Roosevelt stands in marked contrast to the ruthless and disgraceful treatment accorded to veterans by the previous administration.

51. "The good neighbor policy" of President Roosevelt has established good feeling in North and South America and is recognized as a sound and friendly policy among nations.

52. The neutrality law contributes to the peace of the world and is a strong factor in keeping us out of war.

53. Congress is giving consideration to measures that will eliminate profit in war. This is a desirable step.

54. National defense has been improved. The efficiency of the Army and the Navy has been increased, and the Pacific coast has been given consideration.

WOMANHOOD HONORED

55. Following the example of the Wilson administration in aiding women to vote, the recognition of womanhood has been one of the outstanding policies of the New Deal. For the first time a woman occupies a position in the Cabinet—Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor—Ruth Bryan Owen, the first American woman Minister to a foreign country; Nellie Tayloe Ross, the first woman Director of the Mint; Josephine Roche, Assistant Secretary, Treasury Department; Miss Florence E. Allen, judge of United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Ohio.

56. The Interstate Commerce Commission has ordered a substantial reduction in railway fares that will increase public convenience and the income of the railways.

57. Repeal of the eighteenth amendment and increased revenues.

58. The record of the "G-men" in the capture of notorious criminals—Dillinger, Capone, Baby-face Nelson, Hauptmann, and many others.

59. The increase of income and inheritance taxes in the upper brackets; the capture of taxes from the Morgans, Mellons, Mitchells, Raskobs, Du Ponts, and other fat dodgers.

60. Congress has under consideration a tax plan to reach immense surpluses of giant corporations. Hear 'em yelp.

61. Canceled the air-mail contracts that were made in collusion and saved millions to the Government.

62. A reciprocal-tariff law which has increased foreign trade and widened the markets for California products.

63. One of the commendable achievements of this administration is the enemies it has made—the American Liberty League, the agencies of predatory wealth and reaction, the subsidized press, the rugged racketeers who pluck and pilfer from the pockets of the poor. The only escape from greed, ruin, and revolution is on with the New Deal; on with social and economic justice; on with Roosevelt. In the words of Admiral Farragut, "Full speed ahead! Damn the torpedoes!"

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS—PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF HOUSE

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House tomorrow, Tuesday, and the following day, Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE JAMES M. BECK

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the books in my library that I value highly is May It Please the Court, by Hon. James M. Beck. Inside of it, written with a pen, is "To my friend and colleague, Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON, with the best of wishes of James M. Beck. February 10, 1931."

Mr. Speaker, some of the greatest speeches ever made from this floor on the Constitution, on Abraham Lincoln, on George Washington, on Thomas Jefferson, and on Shakespeare were made by the Honorable James M. Beck, who passed away yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that those speeches may be printed together as a House document. It would be one of the finest and most valuable documents that we could place in the hands of the school children of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman taken that up with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LAMBETH], the chairman of the Committee on Printing?

Mr. BLANTON. I did in a previous Congress, and it was agreeable to him. I have not taken it up with the present chairman of the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that the gentleman take that up with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LAMBETH].

Mr. BLANTON. I shall, and then present my unanimous request later. I withdraw it for the present.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Nation lost one of its most brilliant sons and the Constitution its best friend when James M. Beck died.

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE SUPREME COURT

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a radio address I delivered over the Yankee network on Friday last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the radio on April 9:

The greater part of our Constitution is about 147 years old. It is not necessary to tell you of the events and circumstances under which it was framed. We all know that it resulted from a lack of individual freedom and from oppression. Our forefathers of colonial America found that the old regulations and restrictions had followed them to their new land and that they did not enjoy even the freedom guaranteed to English subjects by the Magna Carta and the English Bill and Petition of Rights. Then followed the protest against "taxation without representation", with the resultant break from the ties of England.

To safeguard their freedom and their rights they framed the Federal Constitution, and into it went all of the lessons learned through years of oppression and domination. They knew through

bitter experience the disastrous consequences resulting from concentration of power. They saw that the old order must be reversed—that the people are the masters, the Government and its officers their servants. In simple, understandable language it cleared the American air of intolerance and discrimination.

This document was framed by the master minds of their generation, who had full knowledge of the political needs of that era and of the remedies required. They were men of the deepest learning and experience.

During this period of 147 years since the Constitution was drawn the Government and the people of the United States experienced tremendous and far-reaching economic and social changes, and the Constitution through it all was the basic foundation upon which this Government depended.

Its existence has survived four major wars and the greatest industrial and social changes in the history of the world. The Nation has grown from 13 States to 48 States; from the towers of Manhattan to the Golden Gate, and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf; from a few million to a huge country of 125,000,000 people. Yes, from the "horse and buggy" and mud roads to thousands of miles of concrete highways, high-speed automobiles, and railroads with steam and electric trains; from message by carrier to the telegraph and telephone; from the wooden horse plow and cradle to the mechanical powered multiple plow and huge combine; from clipper ships on the sea to clipper ships over the sea, and around-the-world flights; from the wooden age to the iron age, to the steel age, to the electrical age, this great Nation has passed. And during all of this progress the Constitution has been steadily applicable and adequate as the basic law of the land. It has even encountered and weathered severe depressions on previous occasions.

Wisely and with remarkable foresight, the framers of the Constitution provided for a method for changing it. But in prescribing that method they again protected the people. Neither the President, Congress, nor the Supreme Court can make such a change. Such responsibility is reserved for the people, and the people alone. In that fact lies our security, our independence, and our freedom from oppressing regulation. The American people have shown from the beginning that they believe the Constitution is the very background of their stability as a Nation. That they are very chary of changing it is proved by the fact that it takes such a long time to adopt an amendment. That is the only way our charter of rights should be changed. That is the will of the people.

Our forefathers were suspicious of government. That was why they were so careful to be sure that the Government must never be permitted to become a menace to the honest citizen conducting an honest business in an honest way.

Article III of the Constitution provides that the judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. According to some noted commentators on the Constitution, the function of the Supreme Court is to determine the rights and duties of parties in accord with the Federal Constitution. The Court deals with cases, not with general questions of constitutional interpretation. It determines which of two opposing parties has the better right in accord with the law. It does not nullify acts of Congress (as some people think), but rather just refuses to enforce any act which would operate to deprive one of the parties to the suit of rights given to him by the Constitution. The Court only deals with acts of Congress when they are involved in a lawsuit between parties and over which it has jurisdiction. The Court has no power to determine for Congress, the President, the Attorney General, or anyone the validity or invalidity of such an act.

During the last few years we have heard much criticism of the Constitution and the Supreme Court. It has been asserted that the Constitution is a worn-out instrument adapted to early American conditions, and that it should be reconstructed, rewritten, or abolished entirely. Suggestions have been made that the Supreme Court be increased in number, that its power be taken away and placed in the hands of the legislative branch.

While all of us view these assaults on our traditional form of government with alarm, still we realize that they come from those with selfish interests and not from the great mass of people who are protected by the Constitution. New England would stand to lose much by any such change—more so than any other section of the country. New England paid more in processing taxes and would be obliged to do so again in the event of such a change.

The American farmer is truly loyal to his Government and to his country. He will not tolerate such assertions regarding the Constitution and the Supreme Court, let alone make them. The same can be said of industry. The workers of agriculture and industry built this great land of freedom and liberty. They will not countenance the abolition of the greatest charter in the history of government. They realize that every attempt against the Constitution has been made with one purpose in view—to obtain more authority over the people and to leave the people with less authority over their own affairs.

These cries for a change of form of government come from certain groups and classes of citizens who are literally clamoring at the door of the Public Treasury, demanding public moneys through special privilege, at the expense of the public at large. When their schemes are frustrated by the safeguards of the Constitution their attention is turned to an attack upon those safeguards. It is no new thing; the Constitution has been criticized and assailed throughout the entire existence of our Republic.

It is especially encouraging to note the wholehearted manner in which the women of America have protested against such at-

tacks. Through their organizations, both political and nonpolitical, they have gone on record as being strenuously opposed to any move to break down our traditional and proved form of government. It is most reassuring.

The worker in the mill and the laborer on the farm have come to realize, through education by way of the press and the radio, that any program which has as its object the regimentation or regulation of output of either crops or manufactures, is against their own best interests. They know that such regimentation means a scarcity of work; someone must be laid off to control output. When the Supreme Court by its decisions protects their interests, they know and realize that their form of government has again been proved the fairest and most just for all in every walk of life.

We have only to turn our eyes to the other nations of the world and compare our opportunities and privileges with theirs. It is easier to own a motor car in the United States than it is to own a bicycle anywhere else in the world. None of us would change places with a German under Hitler, an Italian under Mussolini, or a Russian bowing to the will of a Stalin. Other countries look with amazement upon certain Americans who are willing to scrap a system of government that has been the envy of all nations and the model for many. Doubtless there are nations that would be only too glad to see this country descend to their level, making our laws imitate theirs and our standards of living on a lower plane with theirs. We of America should be—and the majority of us are—content to be bound by the safeguards of a written document, one that has been tested and proved, and that has served to bring freedom, progress, and happiness as has no other document in the history of the world.

THE WAGNER-ELLENBOGEN LOW-COST HOUSING BILL HAS RECEIVED THE ENDORSEMENT OF THE SCRIPPS-HOWARD NEWSPAPERS

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that it will be of interest to the Members of Congress to know that to the many pledges of support and aid which have come forward since the introduction of the Wagner-Ellenbogen low-rent housing bill several weeks ago has now been added the endorsement of the Scripps-Howard chain of newspapers.

In an editorial which appeared in the Pittsburgh Press on April 11, 1936, and in other Scripps-Howard papers, the Wagner-Ellenbogen bill is recognized as a "rallying point" for all those who recognize that an effective housing program is a vital part of any national system of social progress.

Stating that the proposed legislation is "more statesmanlike than any slum-abatement plan so far broached", the editorial points out that "it corrects five mistakes that have marred former rehousing efforts." Analyzing the bill's specific provisions, the editorial further commends the rectification of these mistakes. It calls attention to the fact that—

First, it fathers all Federal housing activities under one head—the United States Housing Authority, a board of five, with the Interior Secretary as ex-officio member. Today housing functions are scattered through several agencies in Washington.

Next, it recognizes rehousing as not only an emergency, make-work project, but as a long-term construction job. It is a 4-year program.

Next, it decentralizes building activities. Federal loans and grants are to be made to local housing authorities, except for certain demonstration projects conducted by the Government "where local instrumentalities are inadequate." It is absurd to expect Uncle Sam to act as a landlord and rent collector.

Next, it confines Government aid to a field that private capital has relinquished—truly low-cost housing. Previous efforts under the Federal Housing Administration, limited-dividend corporations, and P. W. A. have resulted in costs that put good housing beyond reach of the low-bracket incomes. The best result in recent housing provides homes renting monthly for \$9.50 a room. Even at \$7.50 a room a normal family of five would have to pay \$315 a year in rent. Considering that 12,000,000 families had incomes of less than \$1,000 a year in 1929, this is far too much.

Finally, the Wagner-Ellenbogen bill's financing plans are less grandiose than those hitherto broached. For 1937 self-liquidating loans to local housing authorities would be limited to one hundred millions and for the 3 next years to one hundred and fifty millions. Grants are limited to fifty-one million in 1937, seventy-five million the next, and one hundred million for the next 2 years.

It is truly gratifying to the sponsors of this bill, and to its numerous supporters, that its positive merits have been so quickly recognized and commended. I believe that everyone who becomes acquainted with the provisions of the Wagner-Ellenbogen bill, and with the housing conditions in this country, which make its enactment a prime necessity, will unite in giving their wholehearted support to it.

LOANS TO REHABILITATE FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I submit a conference report upon the bill (H. R. 11968) relating to the authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make rehabilitation loans for the repair of damages caused by floods, or other catastrophes, for printing under the rule.

RICHARD YATES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere and deep regret that I announce to the House the death of one of its very distinguished former Members. I learned this morning that Richard Yates, a former Governor of Illinois and a Member of this House for 14 years, passed to the Great Beyond on Saturday night last. Ex-Governor Yates, who served here so long and ably, when he left this body, moved near Royal Oak, Mich., my home city. I knew him for a great many years and came to love, honor, and respect him. The country has lost an outstanding citizen and the State of Illinois a great servant.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and the special order, the Resident Commissioner from the Philippines may have permission to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. I have no objection to this gentleman's speaking, but we Members from the storm-ridden and flood-devastated territory are very much interested in the bill now in conference, because it is our hope to get loans with which to rehabilitate the damages to homes and public buildings caused by floods and storms.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman that the conference report takes preference over anything else.

Mr. RANKIN. Then the gentleman assures me that this will not interfere with the consideration of the conference report?

Mr. O'CONNOR. A conference report is privileged.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 60]

Adair	Darrow	Gavagan	Kocialkowski
Allen	Dear	Gifford	Lambertson
Andrews, N. Y.	Dietrich	Greenwood	Lanham
Barden	Dingell	Gregory	Lehibach
Beam	Disney	Haines	Lucas
Berlin	Dorsey	Hancock, N. C.	McAndrews
Bolton	Driscoll	Harian	McFarlane
Brennan	Duffy, N. Y.	Hartley	McGehee
Brooks	Dunn, Miss.	Healey	McGrath
Buckbee	Dunn, Pa.	Hess	McGroarty
Bulwinkle	Eaton	Higgins, Conn.	McKeough
Burch	Eckert	Higgins, Mass.	McLaughlin
Caldwell	Faddis	Hobbs	McMillan
Cary	Fenerty	Hoepfel	May
Cavichia	Ferguson	Hook	Meeks
Claiborne	Fernandez	Jenckes, Ind.	Mitchell, Ill.
Clark, N. C.	Fiesinger	Jenkins, Ohio	Monaghan
Collins	Fish	Johnson, Okla.	Montague
Connery	Flannagan	Kee	Moritz
Crosby	Frey	Kelly	Nichols
Crowe	Gasque	Kerr	O'Brien
Culkin	Gassaway	Kniffin	Oliver

Palmisano	Sadowski	Steagall	Tobey
Perkins	Sanders, La.	Sumners, Tex.	Underwood
Quinn	Sandlin	Sweeney	Wadsworth
Reed, Ill.	Schaefer	Taber	Weaver
Richards	Schuetz	Thom	Wigglesworth
Romjue	Scrugham	Thomas	Williams
Russell	Smith, W. Va.	Thurston	Withrow
Sabath	Starnes	Tinkham	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'CONNOR). Three hundred and ten Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

ELLIS DUKE—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 447)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 4086, "An act for the relief of Ellis Duke, also known as Elias Duke."

This act provides "that the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ellis Duke, also known as Elias Duke, of the District of Columbia, the owner of the truck hereinafter referred to, the sum of \$1,000 to compensate said Ellis Duke, also known as Elias Duke, for the loss of one Dodge truck, serial no. A918785, which said Dodge truck was illegally seized and confiscated by agents of the United States Government on the 16th day of April 1928, and which said Dodge truck was appropriated by the United States and has never been returned to said Ellis Duke, also known as Elias Duke", etc.

The above truck, containing a quantity of illicit beer, was seized in the possession of three men on a business street in Washington, D. C., by Federal prohibition agents, who also arrested the men. These men and Ellis Duke (Elias Duke) were charged under section 26, title II, of the National Prohibition Act with illegal transportation of intoxicating liquor. The truck was released under said section to Ellis Duke, the owner, upon his giving bond to return the truck to the seizing officers on the day of trial to abide the judgment of the court. Two of the men found in possession of the truck were convicted and Duke and the remaining defendant were acquitted. Petition was filed by Duke for the recovery of the truck and was denied by the court. The Secretary of the Treasury filed an application in accordance with the act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1116), that the truck be delivered to the Treasury Department for use in enforcement of the National Prohibition Act. The court granted said application and entered an order that the truck be delivered to the Treasury Department. Duke's motion for a rehearing of the court's refusal to return the truck to him was denied after the matter had been argued by his attorneys and the attorneys for the Government. The truck was used by the Treasury Department until July 1, 1930, when it was transferred to the Department of Justice in conformity to the "Prohibition Reorganization Act." It also appears that Duke filed a petition for writ of error in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, which was denied. The facts show that this truck was legally seized and duly turned over to the Government in compliance with the statutes in force at the time; moreover, that the rights of the claimant were fully presented to the court and adjudicated adversely to his contentions.

The mere fact that Ellis Duke was found not guilty of violating section 26 of the National Prohibition Act did not give him the right to recover the truck in which the illicit liquor was being transported. Said section provides that upon conviction of the person found in charge of the offending automobile or vehicle, the court, unless good cause to the contrary is shown by the owner, shall order its sale, etc. The act of March 3, 1925, supra, provided for its being delivered to the Treasury, upon application of the Secretary, instead of being sold. Two of the persons found in charge of this truck were actually convicted and sentenced. The claimant having

failed to show good cause to the contrary, the court disposed of the truck by ordering it delivered to the Treasury Department, as authorized by the statute.

The record of this case shows that the claimant's rights have been fully and finally adjudicated in accordance with law by a court of competent jurisdiction. There have been numerous court forfeitures of property used in violation of the National Prohibition Act. Compensating a particular claimant for his loss would appear to be discriminatory. It is likewise obvious that reimbursement for all such forfeitures would be impracticable and unwarranted.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 13, 1936.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be entered at large upon the Journal and ordered printed.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The motion was agreed to.

ACQUISITION OF LAND NEAR WALTER REED GENERAL HOSPITAL RESERVATION—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 448)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3629, a bill authorizing the acquisition of some 22 acres of land lying immediately south of the Walter Reed General Hospital Reservation, D. C., and authorizing an appropriation of \$204,162 therefor.

I have caused this matter to be looked into, and it appears that the purchase of the land in question is advocated for the reasons that it will provide for a possible need for expansion of Army hospital facilities in the event of war, and in the meantime will provide space for the erection of quarters for medical officers attached to the present hospital, resulting in a material annual saving in expenditures.

As to the first of these reasons, it appears from a report by the Acting Secretary of War of April 11, 1935 (printed in H. Rept. No. 2133 and S. Rept. No. 1710), that there now exist certain open areas in the present reservation available for possible wartime ward expansion. In view of this, the fact that other hospital facilities of the War Department, those of the Veterans' Administration, and other governmental agencies will be available for use in case of war, the possibility of providing such additional temporary facilities as may be necessary, and the impracticability and inadvisability of attempting to acquire in time of peace all the additional land which may be required for wartime purposes, I do not feel that the acquisition of the land in question can be justified on the ground of its usefulness in time of war.

As to the other reason, namely, the use of part of the land for the erection thereon of officers' quarters at a material saving in expenditures for commutation, it appears that, of the 105 officers attached to the Walter Reed General Hospital, quarters are now available thereat for about 21. That space can be made available on the existing reservation for installing housing for some twenty-odd additional officers is evidenced by the fact that some 2 years ago the War Department requested, but was not granted, an allotment of emergency funds for that purpose. Convincing proof that the remaining officers should reside upon the reservation to insure the efficient functioning of the hospital has not been supplied. Certainly the theory that all medical personnel connected with the hospital should reside in the immediate vicinity thereof does not obtain with respect to our large civil hospitals. If the land in question is acquired, the War Department proposes at a later date to request funds for the construction thereon of quarters for 50 officers. This would cost approximately \$830,000 and, accounting for interest on the total investment in land and buildings and the cost of heat, light, water, repairs, and upkeep, produces comparatively little, if any, saving as compared with the cost of commutation.

For the foregoing reasons I do not feel justified in giving my approval to this bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 13, 1936.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be entered at large on the Journal, and the bill and message printed as a House document.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message, together with the bill to which it refers, be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

MICHAEL P. LUCAS—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 446)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 2469, entitled "An act for the relief of Michael P. Lucas."

The bill directs that in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, Michael P. Lucas, who was a member of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, shall be held and considered to have been honorably discharged as a member of that organization on the 7th day of December 1918: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

In view of the circumstances connected with this case, as disclosed by the official records of the War Department, I do not feel justified in giving my approval to this measure.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 13, 1936.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objection of the President will be entered at large upon the Journal and the bill and message will be printed as a House document.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President, together with the bill to which it relates, be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF LITERARY AND ARTISTIC WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State with an accompanying memorandum, to the end that legislation may be enacted authorizing an appropriation of the sum of \$6,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the expenses of participation by the United States in the conference at Brussels in 1936 for the purpose of revising the convention for the protection of literary and artistic works, concluded at Rome, September 9, 1886, and revised at Rome on June 2, 1928.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 13, 1936.

THOMAS JEFFERSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the first special order, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN] is recognized for 15 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundred and ninety-third anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson. Thomas Jefferson was the foremost apostle of liberty—human liberty—the world has ever known. Other men, including many who were associated with him in creating this great Republic, were more interested in the forms of freedom, in liberty as an abstract idea, than in universal emancipation. Some sought to trammel liberty and keep it

within narrow bounds. Many of the founders proposed a system of government which should be little short of a republican monarchy.

But Jefferson had an infinite faith in the people. In days of distrust of the populace, agitation, and revolution, and at a time when democracy was but a name, he stood firm for a government in which the power would be resident not in the men of intellect, of financial influence, or social standing, but in the artificers of the cities, the woodsmen of the frontier, the laborers on the farms and plantations, the seamen along the Atlantic coast. He was the plain people's only champion at a time when they were inarticulate.

Jefferson's birthday this year should be a day upon which we rededicate ourselves to the many great causes and the single great principle—human liberty—for which he fought over a period of 40 years. It may seem trite to recall his services to liberty, his struggling for the doctrine of universal emancipation, but it was not so in his day.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Has the time come when an oration on Thomas Jefferson by a distinguished orator is of no interest to the people? I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 61]

Adair	Driscoll	Jenckes, Ind.	O'Brien
Allen	Duffy, N. Y.	Jenkins, Ohio	Oliver
Andrew, Mass.	Duncan	Johnson, Okla.	Palmisano
Andrews, N. Y.	Dunn, Miss.	Kee	Perkins
Barden	Dunn, Pa.	Kelly	Quinn
Beam	Eaton	Kocialkowski	Reed, Ill.
Berlin	Eckert	Lanham	Richards
Binderup	Faddis	Lehibach	Romjue
Bolton	Fenerty	Lemke	Russell
Brennan	Ferguson	Lesinski	Sabath
Brooks	Fernandez	Lewis, Md.	Sanders, La.
Brown, Mich.	Fiesinger	Lucas	Schaefer
Buckbee	Fish	McAndrews	Schneider, Wis.
Buckley, N. Y.	Flannagan	McFarlane	Schuetz
Bulwinkle	Frey	McGehee	Snell
Burch	Fulmer	McGrath	Stack
Burdick	Gasque	McGroarty	Starnes
Cartwright	Gassaway	McKeough	Steagall
Cary	Gavagan	McLaughlin	Summers, Tex.
Casey	Gifford	McLeod	Thom
Cavicchia	Gray, Ind.	McMillan	Thomas
Claiborne	Gregory	Maloney	Tinkham
Clark, N. C.	Haines	May	Tobey
Collins	Hancock, N. C.	Meeks	Underwood
Crosby	Harlan	Mitchell, Ill.	Wadsworth
Crowe	Hartley	Monaghan	Wearin
Culkin	Healey	Montague	Weaver
Darrow	Higgins, Conn.	Montet	Wigglesworth
Dietrich	Higgins, Mass.	Moritz	Withrow
Disney	Hobbs	Nelson	
Dorsey	Hoeppel	Nichols	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and seven Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN] is recognized for 12 minutes.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I may say, for the benefit of those Members who were not present, that I am saying a few words on Thomas Jefferson, this being the one hundred and ninety-third anniversary of his birth. I had proceeded only a short time when a point of no quorum was made.

His enemies, at home and abroad, sneered at his demands for the fullest form of freedom. They pointed to the excesses of the French Revolution and shuddered at the resulting wars, which drenched Europe with blood from the north to the Red Sea.

"This", they retorted, "is what liberty would give us in America."

But Jefferson never faltered; his vision was keener than theirs, his trust greater, his understanding deeper. Jefferson labored to such avail that he created not only a nation but a party.

It was only a few years afterward that Jefferson became President of a Nation and a party which, largely through his own efforts, were builded on the doctrine that all men are equal in the eyes of nature and the law; that life, liberty, and happiness are inalienable rights; that the function of government is to safeguard and guarantee those rights; and that all authority and inspiration of government are drawn from the consent of the governed.

At the present time, when violent attacks are being made against democracy, not only here but throughout the world, and when the democratic idea is challenged in many countries, it is good to consider, even for a brief moment, the inspiring life and works of the first Democrat of our country, Thomas Jefferson. [Applause.]

It is admitted by the leading students of American history that Thomas Jefferson is one of the great Presidents of our country. He was more than a great President; he was a great man, whose influence is an active force in our own day and will be for generations to come.

Let us ask ourselves why this is so—why Jefferson's name is one to conjure with. Let us analyze his character and review his accomplishments. Let us see what he has done in his own day that is of such vital importance in ours.

First, Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence. Except for a few minor verbal changes suggested by Adams and Franklin, this epoch-making document was entirely the result of his own brain and hand and reflected his own personal views. We need not dwell upon the importance of the Declaration to our country. But consider how much light it throws upon Jefferson's mind and character.

ALL MEN ARE CREATED EQUAL

These words were first used in a great political document by Jefferson. It was not a new idea of philosophy, but it was a new idea in practical politics, and had not Jefferson written the Declaration, these ringing words, it is quite likely, would have been missing therefrom.

What is more, Jefferson meant these words as written—not simply as a fine sentiment to be expressed on an important occasion.

Jefferson was a firm believer in the common people. He trusted them and considered their instincts wholesome and right. On this principle he fought Hamilton—who distrusted the people—doggedly, never yielding an inch. Jefferson could never yield on this principle, for it was the foundation of his political faith. He was sure of his ground. He knew that democracy was safe in the hands of the Americans, because he knew his countrymen.

Consider what this country would be today if Jefferson and those who thought like him had not existed in the Revolutionary period and Hamilton and his supporters had had their way.

We who enjoy religious freedom might fall into the erroneous belief that such freedom came to us as a matter of course. Religious freedom, like political freedom, had to be fought for and fostered. No great advance in civilization or human freedom has ever been accomplished without strife—oftentimes bitter strife. It is well to remember that Jefferson is the author of the Virginia statute separating church and state and guaranteeing religious freedom. In due time this important idea was made part of our Constitution. No one can possibly estimate the amount of good this provision has done and how much it has contributed to our happiness.

Jefferson went further. He fought for the establishment of free public schools, and in due time became the father of the University of Virginia. He knew very well that ignorance and political and religious freedom do not well go together. He knew that the common people required education in order to preserve the liberties that they had won. No one knew better than he that education is the best weapon against tyranny and bigotry, and that an enlightened people cannot be enslaved.

It will always be remembered that nothing gave him so much happiness as the founding of the University of Virginia. He himself was a learned man in the best sense. He had an unquenchable curiosity about all things that

concerned human beings. Knowledge to him was something to be treasured both for its own and for the use that human beings could make of it. For he was a great humanitarian.

Jefferson's opposition to slavery was well known. He was responsible for the Virginia law prohibiting the importation of slaves. In the original draft of the Declaration of Independence one of the important charges he made against George III and his Parliament was that they were responsible for slavery in America—the inhuman traffic in human beings. This was omitted in the final draft out of deference to Adams and Franklin. There was not much he could do about slavery in his own day. What he could, he did.

Jefferson did much to widen the borders of our country. The Louisiana Purchase, for which he was responsible, increased the national territory about 140 percent, and 13 States, in whole or in part, were carved out of it.

It will be remembered that he was the moving spirit behind the Lewis and Clark Expedition, which opened the West to the United States and made it possible for our country to grow as it did.

Jefferson never coveted or courted public office. His personal modesty followed him through life. In a sense he had no ambition whatever except the ambition to spread his democratic principles and do as much good as possible for his country and his countrymen.

He served as Ambassador to France, and later as Secretary of State, in a critical period of our country. He accomplished wonders in international relations. The despatches he sent home are among the great state papers in our possession. His influence as a diplomat is lasting. He won respect for the young Republic abroad.

We can get some estimate of Jefferson as a diplomat from the following words taken from a communication of his to the American Commissioners at Madrid. Jefferson wrote:

We love and we value peace; we know its blessings from experience; we abhor the follies of war and are not untired in its distresses and calamities. Unmeddling with the affairs of other nations, we have hoped that our distance and our disposition would have left us free in the example and indulgence of peace with all the world. * * * We confide in our strength without boasting of it; we respect that of others without fearing it.

[Applause.]

The sentiment behind these words is so modern that had they been written yesterday we would not be astonished.

Jefferson served his country as President for 8 years, years marked by many important achievements. He did not want the Presidency, but his personal desires did not deter him from accepting the office when he realized that he was needed, nor from serving his country well. As President he showed the country that its affairs could be administered properly without catering to wealth and the special interests; he demonstrated to the world that a democracy could function successfully; and that freedom of speech and the press does not endanger the existence of a government. He followed Washington in not accepting a third term, thus helping to establish an important American custom.

Jefferson would not permit the country, while he was President, to embroil itself in any war. Above all, he taught the American people to trust in common sense and in reason.

In all his dealings with his fellow men he was frank and unassuming. He was a loyal friend and a magnanimous opponent. His lifelong fight was against false principles, never against persons. He was a great theorist, but a theorist who kept his feet on the ground. He was the most practical of idealists.

Volumes could be written on Jefferson, the scholar, the civil engineer, the lawyer, the agriculturist, the architect, the inventor, the author, the philosopher, the statesman, the diplomat, the President, the Nation builder.

But if Jefferson himself could choose the subject of one biography of himself, it is certain that the title of the book would be "Jefferson the Democrat", the word "democrat", of course, used in its widest connection.

Jefferson's general attainments were high. His knowledge of men was noteworthy and he was peculiarly fortunate in

having such disciples as Madison and Monroe. Jefferson preferred never to speak of his achievements, and when he was obliged to mention his own work he did so with the utmost modesty. He was, indeed, a great man who took everything, good and evil alike, in his stride.

A roll call of Jefferson's accomplishments and the broad principles he fought for sounds very much like the life work of a dozen statesmen.

"Jeffersonian democracy" is not a mere political catchword. It is a glowing ideal that should animate us regardless of party today, even in the face of triumphs by those who have abandoned his principles, who still manifest distrust in the people's right and ability to govern their own affairs. As against the theory that people were created for the Government, which is at the root of many of our evils today, he proclaimed the principle that the Government was established for the people. Liberty, to him, was not a privilege; it was a right; and government a mere responsibility delegated by the people. The first and only consideration was how much government was necessary to achieve human happiness and freedom—freedom in government, freedom in education, freedom in worship. [Applause.]

It is time to reexamine our Government in the light of these flashes of inspiration enjoyed by our great leader. It is time for us to make a pilgrimage, if only in fancy, to the grave of Thomas Jefferson, and draw renewed faith in the people from the following epitaph, which he wrote himself:

Here was buried Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of American Independence, of the statute of Virginia for religious freedom, and father of the University of Virginia.

[Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I want to commend the gentleman from New York for the very able speech he has made, but I wish to make this observation, that in the city of Washington there are statues of a great many of our distinguished Americans, but as far as I now recall, there is no statue, except the one in the Capitol, of Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. BOYLAN. In reply to the gentleman, I wish to say that at the last session I offered a resolution to appoint a commission to erect a memorial to the memory of Thomas Jefferson in the city of Washington. This commission has functioned, and we now have pending on the Consent Calendar, which I hope will be taken up on next Wednesday, a resolution authorizing us to go ahead with the erection of a statue to the memory of Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I congratulate the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. I yield.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. It would be more fitting and more in keeping with Democratic theories and observance to follow the principles laid down and advocated by Thomas Jefferson rather than to build statues of him, and I think he would feel more complimented by such a course. [Applause.]

Mr. BOYLAN. If the gentleman had any sense of propriety at all, he would not have interjected that remark. There are times and places for all things.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I sincerely believed what I said whether the gentleman believes it or not.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have been intensely interested in the splendid address the gentleman from New York has given us. With the gentleman's permission I would make this observation: The gentleman mentioned Jefferson's service as ambassador to France. When on that occasion he was met at

the dock by Talleyrand, the French wit and diplomat, Talleyrand said to him, "Monsieur Jefferson, you come to take the place of Franklin." Jefferson replied, "Oh, no; not to take his place; no man can do that. I come only to succeed him." I should like to add that Jefferson's humbleness of heart made him the great man the gentleman from New York has portrayed.

Mr. BOYLAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. I yield.

Mr. COLDEN. What does the gentleman think of the idea of making Jefferson's birthday a national holiday?

Mr. BOYLAN. I think it an excellent idea. Critics harp about extraneous matters when we speak of honoring a great American. There is no politics in my speaking today of Jefferson; it is simply paying to him some of the credit and honor he should have had in the many years that have elapsed since his death. Because heretofore his fellow countrymen have been negligent and unappreciative of what Jefferson did for this country is no reason why we today as Members of the American Congress should follow in that pathway. Let us blaze a new trail and honor the statesman who has gone.

A certain philosophy exists today that pays no honor and gives no credit to great men and things of the past. The philosophy of many today is, "What will I get out of it; what does it give to me; what do I care about men who have fashioned a Constitution for this country the fruits of which we today are enjoying, but which we do not appreciate even in part?" [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I appeal to the gentleman from Washington to be generous enough to take out of our friend's speech the heckling interpolation.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. If the gentleman from New York will yield, Mr. Speaker, I had the gentleman from Texas in mind when I was speaking of Jefferson and his principles and ideals.

Mr. BLANTON. That is so absurd it is ridiculous.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute additional.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yielded to the gentleman from Washington expecting he would ask a question in consonance with the remarks I was making.

Mr. ZIONCHECK rose.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I have risen merely to submit a unanimous-consent request when the gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BOYLAN. And the gentleman's words, the gentleman's conduct, and the gentleman's action will speak for themselves. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3483) to provide for rural electrification, and for other purposes, with House amendments, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, what changes are to be adjusted between the House and the Senate on this bill?

Mr. RAYBURN. It was a Senate bill. The House has made changes in the Senate bill.

Mr. BLANTON. It has never been to conference at all? This is the first conference?

Mr. RAYBURN. That is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RAYBURN, HUDDLESTON, and MAPES.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHANNON] for 20 minutes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 62]

Adair	Duffey, Ohio	Hoeppel	O'Brien
Allen	Duffy, N. Y.	Jenckes, Ind.	O'Day
Andrew, Mass.	Dunn, Miss.	Jenkins, Ohio	Oliver
Andrews, N. Y.	Dunn, Pa.	Johnson, Okla.	O'Malley
Barden	Eagle	Kee	Palmisano
Beam	Eaton	Keller	Perkins
Berlin	Eckert	Kelly	Peyser
Bland	Evans	Kennedy, N. Y.	Quinn
Bloom	Faddis	Kerr	Reed, Ill.
Bolton	Fenerty	Kocialkowski	Richards
Brennan	Ferguson	Lanham	Robertson
Brooks	Fernandez	Lea, Calif.	Romjue
Brown, Mich.	Fiesinger	Lehlbach	Russell
Buckbee	Fish	Lemke	Sabath
Buckley, N. Y.	Flannagan	Lesinski	Sanders, La.
Bulwinkle	Ford, Calif.	Lewis, Md.	Schaefer
Burch	Frey	Lucas	Schuetz
Burdick	Gasque	McAndrews	Smith, W. Va.
Cannon, Wis.	Gassaway	McClellan	Snell
Cartwright	Gavagan	McFarlane	Somers, N. Y.
Cary	Gearhart	McGehee	Starnes
Caviechia	Gifford	McGrath	Steagall
Cellar	Gray, Ind.	McKeough	Summers, Tex.
Clalborne	Gray, Pa.	McLaughlin	Taylor, Colo.
Clark, Idaho	Greenway	McLean	Thom
Clark, N. C.	Greenwood	McMillan	Thomas
Connery	Gregory	McReynolds	Thomason
Corning	Haines	McSwain	Tinkham
Crosby	Hamlin	Maloney	Tobey
Crowe	Hancock, N. C.	Mansfield	Tonry
Culkin	Harlan	Marshall	Treadway
Cummings	Hart	May	Underwood
Darrow	Harter	Meeks	Vinson, Ky.
Dear	Hartley	Mitchell, Ill.	Wadsworth
Delaney	Healey	Monaghan	Warren
Dickstein	Hennings	Montague	Wearin
Dies	Hess	Montet	Weaver
Dietrich	Higgins, Conn.	Moran	Wigglesworth
Disney	Higgins, Mass.	Moritz	Wilson, La.
Dorsey	Hill, Knute	Murdock	Withrow
Driscoll	Hobbs	Nichols	Woodrum

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Two hundred and sixty-five Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. BANKHEAD, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from Missouri proceeds, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House, this is the day set aside for the consideration of District of Columbia business. The District of Columbia Committee has very important functions to perform with reference to the affairs of the people of the District. They have brought up a bill here for consideration which they regard as of very great importance to the people of the District of Columbia. Whether you expect to support the bill or whether you expect to oppose it, the committee, it seems to me, is entitled to have the bill considered on its merits, and the Members of the House should be afforded an opportunity to vote on it one way or the other. Of course, I cannot control, and it is not my function to undertake to control, the activities of any Member, but I do appeal

particularly to those on my side of the aisle, in view of the dilatory tactics that are being pursued, to stay here in order to constitute a quorum, because no time is saved by the Members going to their offices. These constantly recurring roll calls will only require you to walk back over here. Just about the time you get to your office you will have to come back again.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a reasonable request, and I appeal to the Members of the House to observe it if possible. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHANNON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a poem that was rendered in the Congress that voted on the Louisiana Purchase.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I cannot let this one hundred and ninety-third anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson pass without again calling to mind, as I have been privileged to do many times in the past, the great services that this supreme American performed for his country and the broad and enlightened vision with which he viewed its future destiny when its first great opportunity for expansion was offered for his consideration and judgment as the head of the Nation.

QUESTIONABLE TRIBUTES TO JEFFERSON

We are hearing a great deal in these days from the former beneficiaries of special privilege about Thomas Jefferson. You would think to hear some of the speeches that are being made by the orators of the storm troops that Jefferson and not Hamilton was the founder of what they are pleased to call the American system. They seem to have suddenly discovered virtues in the man of Monticello that they never suspected before. Of course, no one would think for a moment that the motives of these revivalists of Jeffersonian doctrines are not genuine. And yet at this moment I can recall a period not so far distant when the name of Thomas Jefferson was anathema to the high priests of the opposition party and when their elephants would trumpet scorn and derision when his name was mentioned.

From the days of William McKinley, the tariff builder, to those of Calvin Coolidge, the silent man of small economies, Thomas Jefferson was a forgotten man. They called him a Socialist and a Revolutionist; they even tried to deny that his was the brain and his the hand that framed the immortal Declaration of Independence; they discouraged mention of him in the schools of the land by an insidious propaganda, and I am credibly informed that by an official order his very statue was once removed from the Capitol Grounds here in Washington. But now the shoe is on the other foot and we are being constantly reminded how far we have departed from the simple faith of Jefferson and the pure democracy that he advocated.

The enemies of this administration have suddenly discovered what a great man he was. But let me take this occasion to say that these gentlemen who seek to link the name of Jefferson with their interpretations of the slogans of their villifying campaign—liberty, constitutionalism, and what they are pleased to call the American system—know little of Jefferson or the history that he made. There is more dust being blown into the eyes of the American people today than comes from the dust storms of the western prairies. We all have heard that the devil can quote Scripture for his own purposes, and the praise of Jefferson by those seeking to discredit the present administration is a gift horse whose teeth will bear looking into.

I yield to no man in my reverence for the memory of Thomas Jefferson and my faith in the doctrines he espoused. I raised my voice, when his portrait was rarely to be found in a public school and when his doctrines were subtly denounced as subversive of American ideals, to reestablish his memory among the youth of our country. I was laughed at by the opposition for my pains. And yet today, in my own

State, we have a Jefferson holiday, a monument to him on the university grounds, and his portrait is found displayed in the halls of learning. I am sorry that I can lay no claim to the late conversion of the Liberty Leaguers and others, and I am afraid that when I remind them of a few things about Jefferson that they seem to have forgotten their sudden faith may evaporate.

JEFFERSON AND THE CONSTITUTION

It may come as a great shock to the present advocates of constitutionalism to be told that, strict constructionist of the Constitution though he was, Jefferson was the first President to challenge its limitations in what he considered the greatest opportunity for expansion, the greatest national emergency, if you will, that ever confronted the Nation. He challenged it upon the ground of public welfare, the welfare of the Nation, and when the test came in the Louisiana Purchase, he rushed the passage of a resolution ratifying that great treaty through the Congress in spite of the lack of constitutional power. It was, as another Democratic President said, "a condition and not a theory" that confronted him, and he acted upon it with a broadness of vision, a courage, and a spirit of true statesmanship that was equal to the emergency.

Not only did Jefferson ignore the lack of express power in the Constitution to enable him to acquire the Louisiana Territory, but he shut his eyes to a more sacred doctrine enunciated in his own Declaration of Independence, that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." Within the territories to be acquired were some 38,000 free people, the citizens of a foreign power. They were absorbed in the deal without their consent; they passed from one government to another without a voice of choice.

Why did Jefferson do such violence to his well-known principles in this particular case? It was a supreme necessity. It was a stupendous opportunity to lay the foundations of the future glory of the Nation, a great emergency that called for the operation of one of the cornerstones of the preamble, the public-welfare clause, and Jefferson, in the teeth of Hamiltonian opposition and in spite of the warning voices of the Federal judiciary, held the public welfare, or, what is the same thing, the welfare of the Nation, to be a consideration more potent and binding than any generality of the Constitution or any high-sounding phrase of the Declaration of Independence.

He cast his prophetic vision across the waters of the Mississippi to the Pacific Ocean, and he saw in the far rolling prairies of the West not only a domain from which was to be carved the great States of the Union that now occupy it, but, agriculturist as he was, he saw there the bread basket of the expanded Nation of the future, the great granary from which a Nation extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific was to be fed. He visioned all this from the borders of the 17 States then in existence, when the opponents of the purchase saw there only a vast wilderness. Stickler as he became for strict construction when the great constitutional document was fashioned to his heart's desire, when he found therein no express authority to acquire foreign lands by purchase he took shelter under the welfare clause; and where is there a statesman, or a citizen, in the land today, in high or in low place, who will challenge the judgment that bequeathed such an empire to the United States of America?

THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE A PRECEDENT

But that is not all that Jefferson's unconstitutional action did for the Nation. The Louisiana Purchase became a precedent. It leaped over the strict interpretation of the constitutional powers, and in so doing it created a new power, a new authority, for future purchases and acquisitions in the South and in the West and in far Alaska. Above every statesman of his day, Jefferson has the right to be known as America's greatest expansionist, the prophet of the Nation's future, and the first of the Presidents to realize the meaning of the ninth amendment to the Constitution which he was instrumental in having adopted among the overlooked Bill of Rights, to wit, the amendment which says:

The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

These reserved rights, Jefferson, in his great territorial deal, found sufficiently shielded in the preamble which declared as a primary principle that the Constitution was enacted "to promote the general welfare"; at least, whether he specially found authority in that clause or not, he stretched the written provisions of the Constitution to cover what he deemed a national emergency, a supreme necessity in the expansion and development of the young Republic whose destinies he held paramount to every other consideration. And this was long before the Supreme Court made use of Chief Justice Marshall's discovery that the Constitution had "implied powers" which became the bulwark and the shield of trusts, monopolies, and the exploitation of privileged interests. What a contrast with the motives of Jefferson, whose liberal interpretation of the great document opened the way for the establishment of the great States of the West, for the fur traders, for the development of the rich mineral and agricultural regions between the Mississippi and the Rockies, and for the millions of home lands that came to be opened and developed with the great tides of western immigration.

Let us on this occasion turn back and read again this footnote to our history which has been more or less forgotten in its origins. When England recognized the independence of the United States as "free, sovereign, and independent States", those Thirteen Original States occupied a territory extending from the Great Lakes to about 50 miles north of the Gulf of Mexico and from the Atlantic Ocean to the east banks of the Mississippi. Florida was under the dominion of Spain, and for a time Louisiana, vaguely defined, was also under Spanish dominion. Controlling New Orleans at the mouth of the Mississippi, Spain was a menace to the navigation of the river to the Gulf. By treaty Spain was induced to give us certain rights of deposit and transshipment from the port of New Orleans, and all was quiet for a while along the Mississippi.

But along about the year 1800, in the shifting tides of European wars, Napoleon, then French Consul, came into possession of the Louisiana Territory by reason of a treaty with Spain. For a time Napoleon had grandiose schemes for building another New France beyond the Mississippi. But a sudden war with England changed his notions and Jefferson, then President, sent ambassadors to deal with him, at first merely for the control of the New Orleans territory. The negotiations dragged along until Jefferson sent James Monroe across the water to speed them up. From the very beginning of the negotiations, Jefferson foresaw that Louisiana in the hands of the French would be a far greater menace to American interests than in the hands of the more placable Spanish Government.

Writing to Livingston, our then Minister to France, Jefferson said:

The cession of Louisiana by Spain to France works most sorely on the United States. It completely reverses all the political relations of the United States and will form a new epoch in our political course. * * * Spain might have retained it quietly for years. Not so France. The impetuosity of her temper, the energy and restlessness of her character, placed in a point of eternal friction with us and our character * * * render it impossible that France and the United States can long continue friends when they meet in so irritable a position.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. My colleague once before made a very splendid speech on Jefferson. I understand that a great authority on Jefferson here in the United States said that it was one of the best speeches on Jefferson that he had ever read. Is that the fact?

Mr. SHANNON. That was Mr. Beck?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. The gentleman is making such a splendid speech now, Mr. Speaker, that I think we ought to have a quorum present, and I make a point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UTTERBACK). The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. A call of the House was refused.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHANNON] will proceed.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the House cannot proceed without a quorum.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was refused.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the House cannot proceed without a quorum being present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 63]

Adair	Dies	Higgins, Conn.	Moritz
Allen	Dietrich	Higgins, Mass.	Murdock
Andresen	Dirksen	Hill, Knute	Nichols
Andrew, Mass.	Disney	Hobbs	O'Brien
Andrews, N. Y.	Dorsey	Hoepfel	Oliver
Barden	Driscoll	Hope	Palmisano
Beam	Duffey, Ohio	Jenckes, Ind.	Perkins
Berlin	Duffy, N. Y.	Jenkins, Ohio	Quinn
Bland	Dunn, Miss.	Johnson, Okla.	Reed, Ill.
Bolton	Dunn, Pa.	Kee	Richards
Brennan	Eagle	Keller	Robinson, Utah
Brooks	Eaton	Kelly	Romjue
Brown, Mich.	Eckert	Kerr	Russell
Buckbee	Faddis	Kocalkowski	Sabath
Buckley, N. Y.	Fenerty	Lanham	Sanders, La.
Bulwinkle	Ferguson	Lea, Calif.	Schaefer
Burch	Fernandez	Lehlbach	Schuetz
Burdick	Fiesinger	Lemke	Schulte
Caldwell	Fish	Lesinski	Scrugham
Cannon, Wis.	Fitzpatrick	Lewis, Md.	Sears
Cary	Flannagan	Lucas	Secrest
Cavichia	Ford, Calif.	McAndrews	Snell
Chapman	Frey	McFarlane	Starnes
Claborne	Gambrill	McGehee	Steagall
Clark, Idaho	Gasque	McGrath	Summers, Tex.
Clark, N. C.	Gassaway	McGroarty	Thom
Coffee	Gavagan	McKeough	Thomas
Collins	Gifford	McLaughlin	Tinkham
Connery	Gray, Pa.	McLean	Tobey
Cooper, Ohio	Greenway	McMillan	Treadway
Crosby	Gregory	Maloney	Underwood
Crowe	Haines	May	Wadsworth
Crowther	Hamlin	Meeks	Weaver
Culkin	Hancock, N. C.	Mitchell, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Cummings	Harlan	Monaghan	Wilcox
Darrow	Hartley	Montague	Wilson, La.
Dear	Healey	Montet	Withrow
DeRouen	Hess	Moran	Zimmerman

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'CONNOR). Two hundred and seventy-six Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. BANKHEAD, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHANNON] has 18 minutes remaining. Does the gentleman yield for that purpose?

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. SHANNON. I yielded to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] and I guess I can yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] asks unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHANNON] is recognized for 18 minutes.

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, at the very outset of the negotiations, he saw that an imperial France and a peace-loving and proud nation like the United States could not long endure as national neighbors.

Napoleon himself cut the knot. Hard-pressed by his impending war with Great Britain, and fearful, too, that Great Britain might wrest the American territory from his control,

he suddenly determined to sell the whole Louisiana Territory to the United States, foreseeing that that young Republic could better deal with British aggressions than distant France. He named his price, some \$15,000,000—a staggering sum of money considered in the monetary values of that day, a stupendous figure of debt for the young States to assume through their National Government. But it was an empire that was offered, covering some 800,000 square miles of territory, fitted to sustain millions in the future, and Jefferson clearly visioned that future, as subsequent events proved. He accepted, through his ambassadors, Napoleon's offer.

OPPOSITION OF FEDERALISTS TO LOUISIANA PURCHASE

The treaty was signed, and then came the problem of ratification. The Federalists turned their oratorical guns loose upon him. They charged him with trying to aid the French and not the United States. They said he was buying a wilderness peopled with savages and wild beasts—"taking a wild dash into infinite space"—as one of their orators phrased it. They said the deal was unconstitutional and every Federalistic effort was put forth to prevent its consummation. If the American system was to be interpreted by the Federalists and the Hamiltonians of that day, where would our great West be today?

Jefferson fully realized the difficulties that confronted him. He searched the Constitution and found no express warrant there for the purchase of lands from foreign powers, still less for acquiring jurisdiction over a foreign people "without the consent of the governed." He thought for a time of having the deal ratified by an amendment to the Constitution, but word came from abroad that there was a chance that Napoleon, in case of victory, might change his mind. The constitutional amendment would take time, argument, possible frustration of the great treaty. So he made up his mind that the treaty must be ratified in spite of fancied constitutional prohibitions, in spite, even, of his cherished doctrines established in the Declaration of Independence.

Upon the question of national welfare he took his stand. Writing to Senator Breckenridge on August 12, 1803, he said:

This treaty must, of course, be laid before both Houses, because both have important functions to exercise respecting it. They, I presume, will see their duty to their country in ratifying and paying for it, so as to secure a good which would otherwise probably never again be in their power. But I suppose they must then appeal to the Nation for an additional article to the Constitution approving and confirming an act which the Nation had not previously authorized.

Conscientiously, Jefferson, a strict constructionist, felt that some constitutional warrant must be found for the purchase. But the vicious fight made upon the deal by the Federalists changed his mind. The guns of the opposition were leveled at the measure, challenging its constitutionality, deriding its necessity, and smothering his arguments in a torrent of oratorical abuse. Then Jefferson took the bull by the horns. There was danger that the coveted territory would slip from the grasp of the Nation. Finding some warrant in the general provisions of the constitutional preamble, laying aside academical casuistry, he determined to carry the measure through at all hazards, consoling his political conscience with the thought that the welfare of the Nation and of its people would justify the action.

SUB SILENTIO PROCEDURE

But he realized that he would have to guide the measure past the guns of the opposition as silently as was possible. On August 18, 1803, he wrote another letter to Senator Breckenridge, in which he said:

I wrote you on the 12th instant on the subject of Louisiana and the constitutional provision which might be necessary for it. A letter I received yesterday shows that nothing must be said on that subject which may give a pretext for retraction, but that we should do sub silentio what shall be found necessary.

Jefferson was a good Latin scholar. I am not. But I do not need much Latin to know what sub silentio means. Jefferson, threatened with a retraction of the treaty, saw that it must be slipped through the Federalist lines with the least noise possible—sub silentio was to be the watchword. And sub silentio the great treaty went through the congressional

narrows, and Louisiana Territory became the property of the United States, the richest acquisition ever obtained by any modern nation.

The vote on the ratification of the Louisiana Purchase Treaty in the Senate October 20, 1803, was—yeas 24, nays 6, not voting 3. Among those who did not vote was John Quincy Adams. He was for it, but would not vote for its being put through in this way. There was one vacancy in the Senate at that time. The vote in the House October 25, 1803, was—yeas 90, nays 24. The roll-call vote in both Houses follows:

RECORD OF THE YEAS AND NAYS IN THE SENATE ON THE RATIFICATION OF THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE TREATY, OCTOBER 20, 1803

Yeas (24): Anderson, Joseph (Tenn.), Democrat; Bailey, Theodore (N. Y.), Democrat; Baldwin, Abraham (Ga.), Federalist; Bradley, Stephen Row (Vt.), Democrat; Breckenridge, John (Ky.), Democrat; Brown, John (Ky.), Democrat; Butler, Pierce (S. C.), Democrat; Clinton, De Witt (N. Y.), Democrat; Cocke, William (Tenn.), Condit, John (N. J.), Democrat; Dayton, Johnathan (N. Y.), Democrat; Ellery, Christopher (R. I.), Democrat; Franklin, Jesse (N. C.), Democrat; Jackson, James (Ga.), Democrat; Logan, George (Pa.), Democrat; Maclay, Samuel (Pa.), Democrat; Nicholas, Wilson Cary (Va.), Democrat; Potter, Samuel John (R. I.), Democrat; Smith, Israel (Vt.), Democrat; Smith, Samuel (Md.), Democrat; Stone, David (N. C.), Democrat; Taylor, John (Va.), Democrat; Worthington, Thomas (Ohio), Democrat; Wright, Robert (Md.), Democrat.

Nays (6): Hillhouse, James (Conn.), Federalist; Olcott, Simson (N. H.), Federalist; Pickering, Timothy (Mass.), Federalist; Plumer, William (N. H.), Federalist; Wells, William Hill (Del.), White, Samuel (Del.), Federalist.

Not voting (3): Adams, John Quincy (Mass.), Federalist; Sumter, Thomas (S. C.), Democrat; Giles, William Branch (Va.), Democrat.

RECORD OF THE YEA-AND-NAY VOTE IN THE HOUSE ON A RESOLUTION THAT THE TREATY BETWEEN FRANCE AND THE UNITED STATES, OF APRIL 30, 1803, PROVIDING FOR THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE, BE CARRIED INTO EFFECT OCTOBER 25, 1803

Yeas (90): Alston, Willis (N. C.), War Democrat; Alexander, Nathaniel (N. C.), Democrat; Anderson, Isaac (Pa.), Jefferson Democrat; Archer, John (Md.), Democrat; Bard, David (Pa.), Democrat; Bedinger, George Michael (Ky.), Bishop, Phaniel (Mass.), Blackledge, William (N. C.), Democrat; Boyle, John (Ky.), Democrat; Brown, Robert (Tenn.), Democrat; Butler, William (S. C.), Anti-Federalist; Campbell, George W. (Tenn.), Democrat; Casey, Levi (S. C.), Chittenden, Martin (Vt.), Claggett, Clifton (N. H.), Claiborne, Thomas (Va.), Democrat; Clay, Joseph (Pa.), Clay, Matthew (Va.), Democrat; Clopton, John (Va.), Democrat; Conrad, Frederick (Pa.), Crowningshield, Jacob (Mass.), Democrat; Cutts, Richard (Mass.), Democrat; Dawson, John (Va.), Democrat; Dickson, William (Tenn.); Earle, John (S. C.); Early, Peter (Ga.); Elliott, James (Vt.), Federalist; Eppes, John W. (Va.), Democrat; Eustis, William (Mass.), Democrat; Findley, William (Pa.), Democrat; Fowler, John (Ky.); Goodwyn, Peterson (Va.), Democrat; Gray, Edwin (Va.); Gregg, Andrew (Pa.); Hampton, Wade (S. C.), Democrat; Hanna, John A. (Pa.), Anti-Federalist; Hasbrouck, Josiah (N. Y.); Heister, Joseph (Pa.), Federalist; Hoge, William (Pa.), Federalist; Holmes, David (Va.); Hunt, Samuel (N. H.); Jackson, John G. (Va.), Democrat; Jones, Walter (Va.), Democrat; Kennedy, William (N. C.), Federalist; Knight, Nehemiah (R. I.), Anti-Federalist; Leib, Michael (Pa.), Democrat; Lucas, John B. C. (Pa.), Democrat; Lyon, Matthew (Vt.), Anti-Federalist; McCord, Andrew (N. Y.), McCreery, William (Md.); Meriwether, David (Ga.), Democrat; Mitchell, Samuel L. (N. Y.), Democrat; Moore, Nicholas R. (Md.), Democrat; Moore, Thomas (S. C.); Morrow, Jeremiah (Ohio), Democrat; New, Anthony (Va.), Democrat; Newton, Thomas, Jr. (Va.), Democrat; Nicholson, Joseph H. (Md.), Democrat; Olin, Gideon (Vt.), Democrat; Palmer, Beriah (N. Y.); Patterson, John (N. Y.); Purviance, Samuel D. (N. C.), Jefferson Democrat; Randolph, John (Va.), Democrat (States' Right); Randolph, Thomas M. (Va.), Democrat; Rea, John (Pa.), Democrat; Rhea, John (Tenn.), Democrat; Richards, Jacob (Pa.), Democrat; Rodney, Caesar A. (Del.), Democrat; Root, Erastus (N. Y.), Democrat; Sammons, Thomas (N. Y.), Democrat; Sanford, Thomas (Ky.), Democrat; Seaver, Ebenezer (Mass.), Democrat; Smilie, John (Pa.), Democrat; Smith, John (N. Y.), Democrat; Smith, John (Va.); Stanford, Richard (N. C.), Democrat; Stanton, Joseph (R. I.), Democrat; Stewart, John (Pa.), Democrat; Thomas, David (N. Y.), Democrat; Thompson, Philip R. (Va.), Democrat; Trigg, John (Va.); Van Cortlandt, Philip (N. Y.), Democrat; Varnum, Joseph B. (Mass.); Verplanck, Daniel C. (N. Y.), Federalist; Walton, Matthew (Ky.), Democrat; Whitehill, John (Pa.); Williams, Marmaduke (N. C.), Democrat; Winn, Richard (S. C.), Democrat; Winston, Joseph (N. C.), Democrat; Wynns, Thomas (N. C.), Federalist.

Nays (24): Chamberlin, William (Vt.), Federalist; Cutler, Manasseh (Mass.), Federalist; Dana, Samuel W. (Conn.), Federalist; Davenport, John (Conn.), Federalist; Dwight, Thomas (Mass.), Federalist; Goddard, Calvin (Conn.), Federalist; Griffin, Thomas (Va.); Griswold, Gaylord (N. Y.), Federalist; Hastings, Seth (Mass.), Federalist; Hough, David (N. H.); Lewis, Joseph, Jr. (Va.), Federalist; Lewis, Thomas (Va.); Livingston, Henry W. (N. Y.); Mitchell, Nahum (Mass.), Federalist; Plater, Thomas (Md.); Sands, Joshua (N. Y.); Smith, John Cotton (Conn.), Federalist; Stedman, William (Mass.), Federalist; Stephenson, James

(Va.), Federalist; Taggart, Samuel (Mass.), Federalist; Tenney, Samuel (N. H.); Thatcher, Samuel (Mass.), Democrat; Wadsworth, Peleg (Mass.); Williams, Lemuel (Mass.).

The treaty proper was ratified on October 25, 1803, and acts were passed on November 3, 1803, authorizing the issue of bonds in order to pay France. The constitutional question was never raised again. Whether constitutional or unconstitutional, the territory was ours, by the greater laws of national necessity, by the higher warrants of the general welfare of the Nation and its people.

OTHER TERRITORIAL ACQUISITIONS

But that was not all. The purchase of Louisiana Territory established a precedent which became amalgamated in our constitutional law and interpretation. Jefferson had found a way, *sub silentio*, to enact a treaty for our national benefit. Later we used that way as a precedent for paying Spain \$5,000,000 for Florida, after Andrew Jackson, in his own rough way, had taught the Spaniards of Florida to respect the American flag. We used the same precedent when we paid Mexico \$15,000,000 for Texas and adjacent territories after the Mexican War, and later we paid her, by the same precedent, 10 more millions for the Gadsden Purchase, which gave us the States of Arizona and New Mexico.

Nor was that all that sprang to the benefit of the general welfare from Jefferson's Louisiana treaty. Confident of the value of his great purchase, Jefferson in 1804 sent Lewis and Clark to explore the Northwest Territory, then known as the Oregon country. By reason of the Louisiana Purchase, they traveled then mostly through lands controlled by the United States, but they also pushed their discoveries into the Oregon territory, extending to the Pacific Ocean, so that when the time came to dispute our claims to that territory with the British, the discoveries and claims established by Jefferson's voyageurs gave us primal rights in the Oregon country, and we obtained them by treaty. So, directly springing from Jefferson's unconstitutional act in purchasing Louisiana, the Nation's boundaries at last extended from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf.

JEFFERSON AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS

Perhaps I should close this brief excursion into Jeffersonian history here, but I am tempted to add another footnote while on the constitutional subject. I have said that Jefferson was a strict constructionist of the Constitution when it became fashioned to his heart's desire. But his heart was not wholly in it as it emanated from the Constitutional Convention and was ratified in 1789. He had praised its makers, but he was not wholly satisfied with their product. He found that there were certain rights, dear to the vision of a great American, that, as the document stood, were clearly unconstitutional. He found nothing there to insure freedom of speech, religious liberty, the right of petition by the people, the right to bear arms, the exclusion of soldiers from peaceful domiciles in times of peace, the protection of life and property by due processes of law, trial by jury in civil actions, and a few other things, including the limitation of judicial power, which, in his gospel, came under the heading of natural human rights. As the Constitution stood when ratified, all these rights were unconstitutional. It took 2 years to make them part of the Constitution. It was Jefferson's influence that formulated these human rights into the first 10 amendments to the Constitution and incorporated them there as the Bill of Rights. The Constitution makers had just overlooked them. But Jefferson and his followers made them constitutional; and yet our friends of the opposition in these days, in glorifying this great fundamental charter—which, let me say, I reverence as much as any of them; much more, perhaps, than some of its interpreters—are very fond of explaining to the common people how solicitous the Constitution makers were for their interests by citing the provisions of the Bill of Rights as evidence.

Fortunately for the Jefferson administration, there was no ultrarich editor, operating a large chain of publications, nor was there a Liberty League in existence at that time, and

the Supreme Court of that period had not shown a disposition to take over powers it was never intended that it should have.

Had these conditions of today been in existence then, a test case would undoubtedly have been filed by these protectors of special interests, and perhaps Jefferson would have been thwarted in his project to annex the Louisiana Territory to the United States.

JEFFERSON AND THE JUDICIARY

Jefferson was a great statesman. Whereas a politician sees only the conditions of the present, Jefferson, the statesman, foresaw the events of the future. His remarkable foresight was well illustrated in his vision of the Supreme Court. He made many utterances on the Federal judiciary, but one will suffice on this occasion. In 1820, writing to Mr. Jarvis, he said:

You seem to consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions; a very dangerous doctrine, indeed, and one that would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy. Our judges are as honest as other men are, and no more so. They have with others the same passions for party, for power, and the privilege of their corps.

JEFFERSONIAN LOGIC APPLICABLE TODAY

Jefferson found warrant for his so-called unconstitutional purchase of the Louisiana Territory in the greater laws of national necessity and general welfare.

Is there not a parallel between the supreme necessity which induced Jefferson to ignore the lack of express power in the Constitution when he acquired the Louisiana Territory and the supreme necessity which impelled our President of today to ignore possible constitutional limitations when he set about to alleviate human sufferings?

Just as Jefferson realized that the time which would be consumed in securing a constitutional amendment to ratify the Louisiana Purchase would possibly frustrate the great treaty, so did our present Chief Executive realize that such delay would frustrate all attempts to solve the great problems confronting him. He knew that delay would mean untold sufferings, despair, widespread destitution, and even national bankruptcy.

The relief offered by him extended to all who were in distress due to the inherited depression. And the bankers, many of whom are now raising their voices to deride the policies of this administration, were among the recipients of his relief. This country was in a most precarious financial condition in March 1933, when the President took over the helm of state. On bended knees the bankers begged to be saved. Within 5 days after his inauguration every bank was closed, by his order, and there was immediately set into motion the machinery from which there emerged a financial stability which has restored public confidence in the banking institutions of this country.

Constitutional or unconstitutional, Jefferson acquired the Louisiana Territory. Historians agree that he was right when he did so. And I feel sure that future historians will say of our President of today that, constitutional or unconstitutional, he was right when he took steps to relieve human sufferings.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHANNON. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman has stated, I believe, that the Constitutional Convention overlooked the Bill of Rights.

Mr. SHANNON. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not want to disparage Jefferson's activity with respect to getting the Bill of Rights adopted as a part of the Constitution; but if I recall my history of the convention correctly, the Bill of Rights was considered a very controversial subject in all its elements, and it was decided by the Constitutional Convention to recommend the adoption of the Constitution without the Bill of Rights and allow the States, after they had become States, to ratify the Bill of Rights separately from the principal Constitution.

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Jefferson was Minister to France at the time the Constitution was framed. He wrote many

letters protesting against the failure to incorporate therein a declaration of rights. In a letter to William Rutledge he said:

I am glad to hear that our new Constitution is pretty sure of being accepted by States enough to secure the good it contains and to meet such opposition in some others as to give us hopes it will be accommodated to them by the amendment of its most glaring faults, particularly the want of a declaration of rights.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHANNON. Yes.

Mr. COLDEN. I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri that I have introduced a bill to make Jefferson's birthday a national holiday. What is the gentleman's attitude toward that bill?

Mr. SHANNON. I think that should be done.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. SHANNON. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. The Members on both sides of the aisle have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks made by the gentleman from Missouri on the life and work and influence of Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson is one of the few great historic characters who is universally acclaimed by all Americans, regardless of political affiliations; and in this connection I recall that about 2 years ago the Honorable James M. Beck, who was then a Member of this House, representing a Pennsylvania district, delivered a eulogy upon Thomas Jefferson that I consider one of the finest ever pronounced, and my purpose in rising is to ask unanimous consent that this eulogy be extended in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANNON. I think that is most fitting. Mr. Beck's speech is a very beautiful tribute to Thomas Jefferson, and it has a proper place in the RECORD on this Jefferson day.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just one observation?

Mr. SHANNON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say to my friend the gentleman from California [Mr. COLDEN] and others who may think like he does that they should read one of the most instructive speeches ever delivered here on the subject of creating new national holidays, made by James R. Mann, of Illinois, against making Lincoln's birthday a national holiday. This speech gives some very fine pointers. Jim Mann said we had enough national holidays and that Lincoln himself would not want anything of the kind.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, on this one hundred and ninety-third anniversary of Thomas Jefferson, one of the greatest Americans that has ever lived, a man who was a great States' rights Democrat, a man who was the author of the Declaration of Independence, one of the greatest documents ever written, nothing would be more fitting today, after we have heard these two great speeches eulogizing Thomas Jefferson from our colleague from New York [Mr. BOYLAN] and our colleague from Missouri [Mr. SHANNON], than for the membership of this House, both Democrats and Republicans, to think of the great things that Thomas Jefferson said and did during his lifetime and emulate those things. Nothing, I say, would be better for this country of ours, especially at this particular time. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is making a money-saving speech, and I make the point that no quorum is present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I trust that the gentleman from Texas will not make the point of no quorum. I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania is satisfied to make his speech to the large number of Members now on the floor.

Mr. RICH. The majority leader knows that I am satisfied with the number of Members on the floor.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania does not speak often, and we ought to have a quorum here to hear him.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 64]

Adair	Disney	Hoeppel	O'Brien
Allen	Dorsey	Hook	Oliver
Andresen	Doutrich	Hope	O'Neal
Andrew, Mass.	Driscoll	Jenckes, Ind.	Palmisano
Andrews, N. Y.	Duffey, Ohio	Jenkins, Ohio	Perkins
Beam	Duffy, N. Y.	Johnson, Okla.	Peterson, Fla.
Berlin	Dunn, Miss.	Kee	Pierce
Binderup	Dunn, Pa.	Keller	Quinn
Bolton	Eagle	Kelly	Reed, Ill.
Brennan	Eaton	Kerr	Richards
Brooks	Eckert	Kocialkowski	Romjue
Brown, Mich.	Faddis	Lanham	Russell
Buckbee	Fenerty	Larrabee	Sabath
Buckley, N. Y.	Ferguson	Lea, Calif.	Sanders, La.
Bulwinkle	Fernandez	Lehibach	Sandlin
Burch	Fiesinger	Lemke	Schaefer
Burdick	Flannagan	Lesinski	Schneider
Cannon, Wis.	Ford, Calif.	Lewis, Md.	Schuetz
Cary	Frey	Lucas	Smith, Va.
Claiborne	Gambrill	Lundeen	Snell
Clark, Idaho	Gasque	McAndrews	Starnes
Clark, N. C.	Gassaway	McFarlane	Stegall
Coffee	Gavagan	McGehee	Summers, Tex.
Collins	Gifford	McGrath	Thom
Connery	Gray, Ind.	McKeough	Thomas
Cooper, Ohio	Greenway	McLaughlin	Thurston
Crosby	Gregory	McMillan	Tinkham
Crowe	Haines	Maloney	Tobey
Crowther	Hancock, N. C.	May	Underwood
Culkin	Harlan	Meeks	Wadsworth
Darrow	Hartley	Mitchell, Ill.	Weaver
Dear	Healey	Monaghan	Wigglesworth
DeRouen	Hess	Montague	Wilson, La.
Dickstein	Higgins, Conn.	Montet	Withrow
Dies	Higgins, Mass.	Moran	
Dietrich	Hill, Knute	Moritz	
Dingell	Hobbs	Murdoch	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and eighty-four Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RICH. Members of the House of Representatives, when our colleague, Mr. BOYLAN, spoke a few moments ago he said that the only monument we had to Thomas Jefferson stood in the hallway outside the House of Representatives, and that at no place could a more fitting monument be erected to this great man, Thomas Jefferson, than in the city of Washington.

I believe if the House of Representatives wanted to erect a fitting statue to Thomas Jefferson in Washington, D. C., both Republicans and Democrats alike would vote any sum of money for a monument to that great man here in the city of Washington.

The trouble is that the Members of the House of Representatives have almost forgotten the teachings of Thomas Jefferson. Take the platform where you promised economy of government, balancing the Budget, sound money, elimination of Government in business, and where you lamented the excessive use of money in political activities, and where the last paragraph of the Democratic platform reads, as follows:

In conclusion, to accomplish these purposes and to recover economic liberty, we pledge the nominees of this convention the best efforts of a great party whose founder announced the doctrine which guides us now in the hour of our country's need: Equal rights to all, special privileges to none.

They meant Thomas Jefferson, but let me tell you now that the Democratic Party has forsaken Thomas Jefferson, and only I as a Republican stand up here to laud those things, besides my colleague from New York [Mr. BOYLAN], and my colleague from Missouri [Mr. SHANNON]. I say to you Democrats, follow Thomas Jefferson from now on.

They are talking about building a monument in the city of St. Louis to that great man, Thomas Jefferson, and there has been allocated in an Executive order of December 21, 1935, \$6,750,000 toward this project. They expect to

spend \$30,000,000 to build the monument to Thomas Jefferson in St. Louis. Let me show you the monument they have already constructed in the city of St. Louis, which is a great monument on 1,200 acres of land, a monument which stands out as a memorial to any great man. Why should they waste the money now to build a second monument, to the tune of \$30,000,000 in St. Louis, when we need the money to buy food and clothing to help those in need? The second memorial to Thomas Jefferson is not a necessity in St. Louis. That proposed monument will cost as high as \$325,000 an acre for the property they expect to condemn, on 37 city blocks, wrecking 446 buildings, embracing 290 firms doing an annual business of \$60,000,000 who will have to find other quarters. One hundred and thirty-four firms, according to the Chamber of Commerce of St. Louis, have an investment of \$12,610,000 and pay \$12,000,000 in wages and salaries to the workers in St. Louis. Why destroy all this property? Why should we build a second monument in St. Louis, when we have none to amount to anything in the city of Washington? It is a disgraceful proposal not authorized by Congress. Remember this when the one and one-half billion relief bill comes on the floor soon.

The waste of money going on under the W. P. A. program is scandalous. In this morning's paper Gen. Hugh S. Johnson characterizes the program of the W. P. A. as cruel and stupid.

SYSTEM HUMILIATES BENEFICIARIES; TASKS NEEDLESS, EXPENSIVE
PROGRAM OF W. P. A. CRUEL AND STUPID, HUGH JOHNSON SAYS—SYSTEM
HUMILIATES BENEFICIARIES; TASKS NEEDLESSLY EXPENSIVE

WASHINGTON, April 10.—The work-relief program was termed "as cruel as it is stupid" today in the final report made by Hugh S. Johnson, as New York City W. P. A. administrator, to Harry L. Hopkins.

The document, made public today by Hopkins, sharply criticized what Johnson termed interference in getting the work-relief program started there.

"By actual count", Johnson told Hopkins, "90 percent of my letters asking various authorities and rulings were unanswered, and I was consistently unable to reach you on the telephone, unless I almost literally turned in a riot call."

But that is not all. Let me read to you what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], who is right here on the floor now, says about the W. P. A. He writes under date of April 8 to the Dallas News as follows:

APRIL 8.

DALLAS NEWS:

Since in your editorial of March 30 you mentioned my name in every paragraph, please be fair enough to publish this reply.

If you had been correct in your assumption, based on Mr. Drought's assertion, that the W. P. A. administration in Texas is wholly uncontrolled by politics, the situation would be ideal, and no Congressman would complain. But you were mistaken. He did not tell you the facts.

Harry P. Drought himself is a political appointee, and a patronage selection. Every official under Drought is a political appointee. Every salaried job-holder under Drought is a political appointee. Some are good. But some are bad. There are bad ones who are inefficient, extravagant, wasteful, unworthy, and undeserving. Texas Congressmen are in no way responsible for their selection, yet are criticized and held responsible for their misdeeds. For no other reason did Texas Congressmen complain.

Drought treated Texas Congressmen unfairly and allowed politicians unknown to the people, and who are in no way responsible to the constituents of Congressmen, to select and have appointed those who have been inefficient and unworthy. Texas Congressmen want Harry Drought and his patronage-politicians to assume full responsibility for the misdeeds of their own appointees.

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. BLANTON. And, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the gospel truth.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield to anyone.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please not interrupt without permission of the Member occupying the floor, as it is strictly against the rules.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we should stop these needless expenditures. We should have Congress authorize the expenditures of public funds, not the President, not Mr. Ickes, not Mr. Hopkins, not Mr. Tugwell, but Congress should authorize the projects to be erected to a great man like Thomas Jefferson. Let us have more followers in the Democratic Party of Jefferson and not so many Roosevelt,

Wallace, Ickes, Tugwell followers. Where is the Democratic Party of Jefferson? They who are in Washington masquerading under the name certainly are not adhering to the policies and principles of Jeffersonian teachings. Democrats follow the Sage of Monticello.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

NEW LEXINGTON, OHIO, April 6, 1936.

HON. JOSEPH W. BYRNS,

Speaker of the House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Because of my appointment as United States district judge for the southern district of Ohio, I have the honor to inform you that this day my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Eleventh District of Ohio has been transmitted to the Governor of Ohio, effective at midnight Friday, April 10, 1936.

May I extend my sincere thanks and heartfelt appreciation to you and my colleagues in Congress for their courtesies and friendship during my 14 years of service.

My work and associations have been very pleasant, and I wish for you and my worthy colleagues continued success.

Sincerely,

MELL G. UNDERWOOD.

RENT COMMISSION FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11563) declaring an emergency in the housing condition in the District of Columbia, creating a rent commission for the District of Columbia, prescribing powers and duties of the commission, and for other purposes.

The question was taken.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 148, noes 3.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote because there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-three Members present, a quorum.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11563, with Mr. UMSTEAD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the status of the time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has 40 minutes remaining and the gentlewoman from New Jersey has 22 minutes remaining.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is plainly evident that the filibustering tactics indulged in during the past two District days and again today are aimed as an attack on your chairman rather than the bill under consideration. In view of that being the fact I think the House should know the extent of intimidation your chairman has been subjected to, and in order to bring this clearly before the House I shall read for your consideration a letter received by me on the morning of the last District day from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] and my reply to that letter. The letter is dated March 20, 1936, and is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 20, 1936.

Mrs. MARY T. NORTON,

Chairman, District of Columbia Committee,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR Mrs. NORTON: I am rather surprised to see in this morning's Washington Post under headlines Mrs. NORTON Asks Lump Sum of \$5,700,000, and She Rebukes BLANTON, and She Says House Will Recede, a baseless, unjustified attack upon me, wherein about me you are quoted with having made the following ridiculous statement:

"Mrs. NORTON related how she had sought unsuccessfully to discover his soft spot. 'I have been told he has a soft spot; and if you will find out what it is for me, I will work on it.'"

The only soft spot about me that you could ever work on is the gentlemanly instinct that has been born and bred into my very bone and fiber for generations, to be courteous always to a lady; and, being controlled by that instinct, I have patiently and silently allowed you on many occasions, wholly without you having any ground therefor, to vent your spite and personal spleen against me by making vicious attacks upon me from the floor and in the press. You did so simply because under my oath of office duty had forced me to oppose some very unsound and ridiculous bills you had reported and were trying to pass. And on several occasions the House, after debate, struck out their enacting clause.

I have reached the point now, with your continued spiteful and unjustified attacks, where "forbearance ceases to be a virtue." Simply because you happen to be woman gives you no right whatever to attack a man. You have only the same rights that all of your other colleagues enjoy. And I want you to distinctly understand, clearly and unmistakably, that from now on I intend to answer in kind every attack you make on me.

You just "can't take it." You made your fight and lost. You tried to place upon the already overburdened shoulders of the taxpayers of the States the additional burden of having to contribute \$5,700,000 toward paying the local expenses of the people of Washington, who are the best treated and least taxed of any people living in any other city in the whole world. You lost your fight. The Members wouldn't back you. You had only a corporal guard supporting you. When you forced a rising vote, only a handful of Members voted with you to make your constituents pay this \$5,700,000 in Washington. It made you mad. And then on Friday, March 6, being mad from the day before, when you forced a roll-call vote on the passage of the bill in the House, and you appealed to Members to vote with you, and "worked on their soft spots", as you always do, you could not get but 25 Members to vote with you against the bill, which by a vote of 290 Members for it, passed the 83-page bill without a single amendment. The Members of the House did that, because they did not think like you think.

Your constituents in New Jersey pay three times as much taxes as do the people of Washington, and do not have one-third of the benefits. When the people of Washington have their property assessed at about one-half of its actual value, and then pay only \$1.50 on the \$100 taxes on it and have their intangible property taxed at only one-half of 1 percent, with your constituents and mine paying several times as much, you want our constituents to contribute \$5,700,000.

When Washington people have all of their fine personal libraries, some worth \$100,000, exempt from taxation; when they have all of their wearing apparel, which includes all their personal effects, whether worth \$100 or \$100,000, exempt from taxation; when they pay only 2 cents per gallon tax on gasoline, while all other people in other cities pay twice that much; when they pay only \$1 registration and for license tags on their automobiles, whether Fords or \$12,000 Rolls-Royces, with people in New Jersey and Texas paying 10 times that much; when they have no monthly charge for sewer service, like other people elsewhere pay; when they have all their trees in front of and around their property furnished free, planted free, protected with lumber pens free, sprayed free, pruned free, and replaced free, while people elsewhere have to pay for same; when they are charged nothing for repairing and replacing sidewalks and paved streets in front of their property, like people elsewhere have to pay for; when they get their water furnished for \$6.60 per year for an average family, you think the citizens of the States ought to contribute \$5,700,000.

When the people of Washington pay no income tax; when they pay no inheritance tax; when they pay no estate tax; when they pay no gift tax; when they pay no sales tax, like people in some other cities have to pay; and when during the last 20 years the Government has spent here over \$240,000,000 cash in permanent improvements, which benefits every person in Washington, and when the Government has a pay roll here with 110,000 employees receiving salaries each month, spending their money here, which is a bonanza for Washington, you feel sorry for them, and want our constituents in New Jersey and Texas to contribute \$5,700,000.

Your constituents in New Jersey are just like mine in Texas. They are willing to pay their own taxes, but they don't want to pay the taxes of Washington people. I know that they don't approve of your action.

Since you have seen fit to attack me at a public function simply because I faithfully performed my duty under my oath and was trying to protect your constituents as well as my own from injustice, I am willing to meet you on this issue in your district before your people in your primary campaign and see whether your Democrats will back you in your efforts to unduly tax them. I am going to take it upon myself to let your Democrats know the facts about this issue.

I have been trying to think of one constructive thing you have accomplished for the people of New Jersey since you have been in Congress, and I am not able to do it.

I can think of many bills that you have reported that had their enacting clause stricken out.

I can think of many attempts you have made to backbite and try to injure me in my district, but you did not succeed in doing it.

I can think of many attacks you have made in public on colleagues, but I can't think of anything of any importance that you have ever accomplished since you have been in Congress.

But I haven't gone to public functions and made the above statements about you. I haven't tried to injure you as you have tried to injure me.

I have been decent and courteous to you at all times, and have patiently allowed you to spitefully and maliciously abuse me. I am getting tired of it. As said above, forbearance ceases to be a virtue. I am going to take it no longer. I am going to answer in kind. Every time you attack me I am going to respond in kind.

Very sincerely yours,

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New Jersey has expired.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

This is my reply:

MARCH 24, 1936.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BLANTON: I have your letter of March 20, and admit that upon first reading it achieved its purpose. I was angry beyond words. But upon second reading it produced only amusement that you could be irritated to such a point that you would address such a letter to a colleague; more especially since the cause of your temper is merely a reference to the possibility of your having a "soft spot", a sympathetic tenderness, if you please, for someone or some place. You vigorously deny having any such. I frankly admit having many—for crippled children, for tuberculosis victims, for overcrowded hospital wards, for overworked nurses, for juvenile offenders, for first offenders thrown into crowded jails indiscriminately with hardened criminals, and so on down a long list. Nor am I ashamed of them.

Some things I must suggest in reply. You refer to the \$5,700,000 Federal allowance to the District of Columbia as being my fight, my effort, my burden on the taxpayers. It was not. That figure was the President's figure. He sent the budget of \$5,700,000 to Congress. It was his judgment, his wish, his effort. My feeble attempt was merely to support the President's budget. You were tearing it down. And you not only tore it down, but now you say that anyone who agrees with the President's budget is making a "baseless, unjustified attack" on you. I just cannot reconcile your attitude and your letter with your speech in the House on February 18 of this year. You will recall that you had then described to the House your devotion to the President's budget and your public defense of it against the attack of certain citizens. So far as I am concerned, in regard to the \$5,700,000, I stood and stand now with the suggestion of the President and his Budget Director.

As to the imposition of taxes on our respective constituents, let me remind you that in reducing the District of Columbia budget by \$3,000,000 you saved your constituents and mine about two pennies apiece. That is all that is involved so far as they are concerned. You have voted for many bills that cost your constituents much more money than that; bills that appropriated many millions and even billions. I don't believe that you are wise to raise too great an issue about the tax bills you have opposed as against those you have supported.

And, while we are talking about the District of Columbia budget, let me say that the most amazing thing to me at least about your treatment of that bill was your selection of items to cut. You increased the appropriation for the Zoo and decreased the amounts for tuberculosis dispensaries and for hygiene and sanitation in the public schools. You increased the allowance for the National Training schools, Federal reform institutions for juveniles from all over the United States, and decreased the allowance for Emergency Hospital. You increased the Soldiers and Sailors Home and decreased the Children's Tuberculosis Sanitarium. You increased the expense allowance for the improvement and care of parks and decreased the salaries for the police. You increased the allowance for the militia and for the collection of refuse, but decreased those for prevention of contagious diseases, for bacteriological laboratories, and for child-hygiene service.

As to constructive measures which I have introduced or reported, I would be glad to match my list with yours. I do not seem to recall many constructive "Blanton acts", although you have been in Congress must longer than I have. As a starter I mention, on my account, the old-age pension, the blind pension, the parole law, the Firearms Act, the alley dwelling clearance, the Liquor Control Act, the education of veterans' orphans, the loan to the Children's Hospital, the Auto Responsibility Act, the equal distribution of property to women, smoke control, the removal of dangerous and insanitary buildings. What are some of yours, Mr. BLANTON? Then as to my success in piloting my bills through the House, I admit a great debt of gratitude to my colleagues, but a hurried examination of the records indicates that of a total of 153 bills reported by me as chairman of the District of Columbia Committee in the Seventy-second, Seventy-third, and Seventy-fourth Congresses, only 3 were defeated by a vote of the House. I think that is a pretty fair record. How does it compare with yours?

You mention a lot of things you can think of. Well, the only thing I can think of about you is that you have caused a lot of embarrassment to your constituents, as well as to the membership of the House. You have cost thousands of dollars to the taxpayers of the country for hundreds of pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without a single constructive achievement. I can think of many Representatives from your State who are a credit to the State, but

I can think of you only with sorrow that you should use the many gifts God has given you to crush the less fortunate—to ridicule those in power.

So far as my district is concerned, don't worry about it. Come to it at any time and I shall be there to welcome you. So will my constituents. They would like to get a look at the man who several times defeated my bill to pay \$90,000 owed by the Government to Jersey City for water supplied during the war. You will find, if you come to my district, that my constituents have not only a very high regard for their Representatives but that they also have a very good sense of humor as well.

As to your "courteous and decent" treatment of me, I prefer to let my colleagues in Congress appraise your treatment of me during the past 5 years.

Very truly yours,

(Mrs.) MARY T. NORTON.

[Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time, and I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DOBBINS]. I regret that I have taken 3 minutes of the time I expected to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DOBBINS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DOBBINS] is recognized for 17 minutes.

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I would like, if possible, in the interest of what seems to me proper legislative practice, to bring the attention of the Committee back to the legislation under consideration. I do not care to enter into a popularity contest between two Members or more than two Members of the House, but I feel this House has a very serious duty to perform in connection with this bill, which I know must have created serious misgivings in the minds of many of us.

The first question that arises in the mind of any lawyer when he looks at this bill and considers its provisions is the question as to its constitutionality.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOBBINS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Before the gentleman proceeds further, I wish to remind the Members that he has made a rather painstaking study of this rent bill and of the features of the former rent bill, and I hope he will be given respectful attention.

Mr. DOBBINS. I thank my colleague. When the consideration of this bill began in the Committee of the Whole 5 weeks ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the author of the bill, while explaining its provisions made this statement with reference to the question of its constitutionality, designed to foreclose any further argument upon that phase of the subject:

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. First, about the constitutionality of this bill: Those who say this bill is not constitutional are absolutely wrong, and they know it. The Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Block v. Hirsh* (256 U. S. 135), has declared a statute in the very same language, under the very same circumstances, constitutional.

Later on, my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, took the floor in opposition to the bill, and he yielded to me for an inquiry as to the extent, if any, that this bill might be identical with any law declared constitutional by the Supreme Court. He replied that as he understood it there was only a general similarity.

A little further on in his remarks the gentleman from Pennsylvania said:

In October 1919 this House passed, and the Senate concurred, and the President signed a bill which is practically identical.

The law discussed in the case cited by the gentleman from Pennsylvania in support of his bill is not set out in the committee's report or in the hearings before the District Committee, so far as I can ascertain. I obtained a copy of it from the Library of Congress and compared it paragraph by paragraph with the Ellenbogen bill, H. R. 11563. The Ellenbogen bill has some 25 or 26 sections. Two-thirds of the sections are not even substantially identical with the most nearly corresponding sections of the bill passed upon by the Supreme Court. The remaining third are, I should say, either actually or substantially identical. Some of the sections of the bill passed upon by the Supreme Court are absolutely in conflict with the pending bill. For instance, in

section 106 of the old bill and in section 6 of this bill there appears an introductory clause providing for instituting an inquiry before the rent commission as to fairness of rents by complaint filed by the owner or tenant.

Then in the former law this significant qualification appears:

Except where the tenant is in possession under a lease or other contract the term specified in which has not expired.

In the pending bill there appears the following:

Such complaints may be made and filed—

And so forth—

notwithstanding the existence of a lease or other contract between the tenant and the owner, or between the owner and any guest.

In other words, under this bill you may at your pleasure select a house or an apartment that appeals to you, rent it from the landlord, pay to him the rent that he asks, or agree to pay him, and sign your solemn promise to pay him, and the very next day you can go before the members of the Rent Commission and repudiate that promise of yours. Not only may the tenant do this but the landlord may do it. It would be just as sensible for me to go into a clothing store and purchase a suit of clothes, pay the price asked for it, and, notwithstanding a dozen others may have been clamoring for the same suit, the next day go before some bureaucratic functionary and ask that the price I honestly and fairly agreed to pay for the suit be reduced according to my new notion of what I ought to have paid for it.

Another contradictory provision between this bill and the one passed upon by the Supreme Court is in the definition of the term "rental property." The law which was in part passed upon by the Supreme Court did not include a hotel or apartment in that definition. In the present bill "the term 'rental property' means any hotel, apartment, or rooming house", and so forth. This is in section 2 of the pending bill.

And so you can go through this bill and find all sorts of variations and contrary provisions as compared with the 1919 act. I would judge that the present bill is approximately twice as long as the 1919 law that was passed upon in the case of *Block against Hirsh*.

Does this justify the statement made to those of us who were troubled over the question whether or not this bill may be constitutional? Is this "a statute in the very same language under the very same circumstances"? Of course it is not, and of course such a statement cannot be justified. We should not give our approval to any bill that comes before us with that sort of representation as to its terms, which will not and cannot be verified in any substantial way.

This bill contains another provision—and it was admitted before—and it is the only distinction that was admitted. By this provision the bill exempts property yet to be constructed and limits its provisions to property now in existence. It provides that property built tomorrow, day after tomorrow, or next week shall not come within the terms of this bill.

Now, whether or not that has any bearing upon the question of the constitutionality of the measure, it does certainly have some bearing upon the wisdom of the measure, because if that means anything it means that this bill is admitted to be a burden upon the ownership of property as well as a burden upon the construction of property; therefore it picks out, and picks upon, the owners who have heretofore constructed homes, hotels, rooming houses, or apartments for the housing of the people of the District of Columbia and applies the law to them because they have already done their part to meet our heavy demand for housing, and hence cannot escape its provisions. But recognizing, as we must, that anybody who may hereafter contemplate the construction of property for rental would never voluntarily submit to an autocratic and arbitrary dictation of the kind here proposed, the bill provides that property constructed after this time shall not come within the provisions of this measure. That is a clear admission, it seems to me, that the bill contains an unjustly onerous provision with reference to the ownership and improvement of property.

It is said, by way of argument, that the New York law is the basis for this bill. The New York law is not before us. The New York law was before the Supreme Court in another case briefly reported in the same volume as that containing the opinion on the District of Columbia rent bill of 1919, but the provisions and the terms of the New York law are not discussed.

It is also said in debate on this bill at the last hearing that the law which was declared constitutional was not a war-time measure. The Supreme Court predicated its approval of that bill upon the basis that it was designed to meet an emergency growing out of the World War, and pointed to wartime legislation in other countries designed to meet the same end. They may contend, for it has been so contended privately with me, that numerous amendments came in which may have changed the scope of the 1919 act as it was being considered in the Supreme Court from its form as it appears in the statute books of that time. But remember that the facts upon which this case was decided happened within 2 months after the District of Columbia rent bill became a law. The case immediately started on its way to the courts.

The constitutionality of that entire law was not upheld in the case of Block against Hirsch. The only question that was upheld was the right of a tenant to hold over after his lease expired where the owner of the property had deliberately refrained from giving certain notices which the law provided should be given. It was not an upholding of the validity of the entire law, because that law contained, as this one does, a provision that if any section of that law should be held invalid such holding should not affect the validity of the remainder of the act. This is the so-called separability clause, which appears also in this bill.

That law differed commendably from this bill in that it did not contain any provision reserving to the Congress the right to amend the law in the future, a very novel provision, it seems to me, in any law, since no Congress can in any way impinge upon the inherent and constitutional right of itself or succeeding Congresses to enact new or amendatory laws.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that any time we spend in the passage of this law is time wasted, because this bill is headed as squarely as can be toward a decision of the Supreme Court holding that we have not the right under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States to deprive a citizen of his property without due process of law. Precedent is the only thing that might surprise us into some contrary conclusion, but that precedent does not exist.

Although we were told in debate that the old rent law, after which this bill purports to be modeled, was not a war-time measure, the present bill attempts to declare itself to be a wartime measure, through a preamble reciting that it is necessitated by emergencies growing out of the war against the depression. Of course, in one sense, we are always engaged in a war against some condition or other that ought not to exist, and I want to assure anyone who may believe that wars against depressions will ever cease that he is deluding himself very sadly.

Mr. WEARIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOBBINS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. WEARIN. In view of the fact that many of our people hold positions in this city who have their permanent residences in our respective districts, and they are being gouged out of a considerable portion of their salaries, by reason of high rents, it seems to me something should be done, if this law is not constitutional. It might be possible for us to set up a board of tax review on the part of Congress which would adjust rents to the taxable valuation that is turned in by these landlords who are charging excessive rentals.

Mr. DOBBINS. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEARIN] that I can see no objection, if unfair tax valuations prevail in the District of Columbia, to providing a procedure to make it certain that fair valuations are enforced upon property owners. But so far as our people being gouged is concerned, I cannot see how we can blame the unfortunate property owners in the District of Columbia

for observing the ordinary law of supply and demand in the matter of rental charges, so long as the Government continues bringing into the District of Columbia great numbers of public employees. It is within the power of the Government to put those employees anywhere it pleases. They may decentralize operations here. It is within the power of the Government, if it recognizes some responsibility of its own in connection with this matter, to build additional quarters within which to house its employees, as it did during the World War. May I express my individual belief, however, that this matter of exorbitant rents is very much overemphasized. Naturally we all look for the best there is and we expect to get the very best there is at the average prices as we know them back home, and to which perhaps distance may lend some enchantment. We have people coming here from home, and we like to have them see us in elegant quarters. That is probably a natural desire on our part, but we and not someone else should pay the price for our own vanity. We should not expect the unfortunate property owners who must submit, without suffrage or representation, to our legislative whims, to rent houses to us for less than their actual worth, and this worth is unavoidably and inevitably controlled by the law of supply and demand.

Mr. WEARIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DOBBINS. I yield again to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. WEARIN. The gentleman has very graciously yielded to me, and I think we are more or less in harmony. For example, I have a number of specific cases in which rentals in this city are as much as 20 percent of the value of the property as it has been turned in for taxation purposes. Certainly that is an excessive charge on the part of the landlord.

Mr. DOBBINS. I may say that I am sure if the gentleman will look into each such case he will find that the fault lies in there being an unreasonably low taxable valuation rather than in there being an inordinate return upon the actual valuation of the property.

I certainly know of no real property in the District of Columbia upon which the annual rent is anything like 20 percent of its actual value.

Mr. WEARIN. I have a specific case in mind.

Mr. DOBBINS. That, I infer, is a question of return on the taxable value; and I suspect that on such a basis similar examples might be found in the gentleman's district as well as in my own. I know it is true in some instances in my district.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOBBINS. I yield.

Mr. MILLARD. If the people of the District of Columbia are overassessed, they have a remedy in the courts by way of a writ of certiorari.

Mr. DOBBINS. They unquestionably do. And we have public officials here whose duty it is to see that property is not underassessed. The duty lies upon them rather than upon the property owner to make good such inequities.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOBBINS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. I believe the gentleman will concur with me that we could not pass a constitutional bill which would fix the rent at a definite percentage of the assessed valuation, because of many other factors involved, like light, heat, janitor service, and many other things of that sort.

Mr. DOBBINS. I think that may be true; but, in my opinion, we could come much nearer passing a constitutional bill by basing it upon the factor of tax valuation rather than by deliberately going up to a property owner and taking his property without his consent and then having a commission or bureau come in and fix the amount that should be paid; and especially is this true where you have gone to that man and signed your name to a lease and have solemnly and fairly, without fraud or duress of any kind, agreed to pay a certain rental, and the next day under a law like this you go before a commission and contend that you are paying an unfair rent and ask to have the rent revised.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, when I was a young lad in our family home in Houston, Tex., my father, who was a Virginian by birth, said to me one day, "Son, I want to tell you what my father told me and what his father told him, that while a woman has no more moral right to attack a man than a man has to attack a woman, all through life remember that when a woman attacks you, take it—do not attack back."

I have lived up to that admonition all my life. I do not attack a woman. When they attack I take it. But a man does have the right to defend himself against attacks, made either by man or woman.

I have taken the lead in fights on such bills as this, because it might be that some other colleagues whose duty it is, just as much as it is mine, to take the lead, might be hurt in their districts if they led such fights. I have a district where I will not be hurt, a district where the people understand me, where I was their circuit judge on the bench for 8 years, where they know what I stand for and have confidence in me; and I am prepared to take the resultant slams that some little two-bit newspaper reporters hit me with under the belt in these Washington papers every day when I fight their bills. I am prepared to take it and it does not hurt me. It might hurt some of you good colleagues in a close district where some demagogue was your opponent and the vote is very close on party lines. This is the reason I take the lead lots of times against such bad bills, when you, in your hearts, are just as much against the bills as I am.

Now, because I have led the fight against this unsound bill the statement was made here on the floor by the one handling this bill that "BLANTON is controlled by real-estate men." That was wholly untrue. I do not know a real-estate man in Washington to speak to—not one—and the one who made that statement, just about that time, had their picture appearing in the Washington Post with the real-estate president at a banquet presided over by the president of the real-estate men of Washington, Mr. Saul.

Oh, she has said that I oppose this bill because I was a landlord here in Washington and owned property for rent. That is too ridiculous to deny. Here are the facts about that. When the first rent-control bill came up during the war to create just such a rent commission as this bill proposes to create—the rents were outrageously high then, just as they are now—I was renting a house here. I just jumped in and fought for that bill. My rent was too high, and I thought that the bill would lower rents. I did not know at that time that it would raise rents and that eventually it would be declared unconstitutional, because we were in war and I fought for it just as zealously as our friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. ELLENBOGEN] is now fighting for this bill. We passed the bill, and shortly after it went into effect my rent was increased \$20 a month. It was already so high I could hardly pay it, and this continued all during the life of that rent commission, and its life was extended and extended. Practically all rents were raised. I had to pay this extra rent until I got tired of it and I bought a house. After I bought the house I spent a lot of money improving it. At one time I was paying \$150 a month rent for it unfurnished, with no furnishings of any kind in the vacant house that belonged to the owner.

I had the house painted. I had the big sleeping porch upstairs closed in with glass. I had the garage improved. I had the roof covered with tar. And while it was a comfortable place to live it was too far from my work, and to keep from having to drive through the snow at night when I was working until 12 o'clock in my office, I rented it partly furnished to a good woman for only \$75 per month, when it would have brought much more than that; and during all these years since I have been living at the Methodist Building, paying to them for a small apartment on the fifth floor much more rent than was paid me for the house.

Now, was not it ridiculous to speak of me as a landlord? I wish that I did own some rental property in Washington, but I do not.

Then the Washington Post, in a very derogatory way, quoted the one who has charge of this bill as saying that she thought I must have a soft spot, and if someone would help her find it she would work on it.

I admit that I got incensed over that public attack at a banquet and its publication in a newspaper. Would not you?

I have worked hard for the people of the United States during the 20 years I have been here. Do you know, honestly and truthfully, outside of a bare living for my family and general expenses, I have spent all of my income for 20 years for the public good and in the public service in an attempt to help make the United States a better place for poor people to live in. Every bit of my income for 20 years, above a living, has been spent in the interest of the public welfare.

And yet I have to take these digs by some of these little two-bit reporters in their Washington newspapers every day because I did my duty here.

THIS IS A BAD BILL

Is this a good bill? Is it constitutional? Has it got wise provisions. If it is not good, and is not constitutional, and has not wise provisions, we ought not to pass it. Should we pass a bad bill just because we are friendly to the chairman of the committee? No.

Let me read to you lawyers a provision in this bill. Let me read it to my Irish friend from New York, who has got more good common sense in the back of his head than almost any other man whom I have ever seen from New York. [Laughter and applause.]

Let me read this provision:

SEC. 24. The right to alter, amend, or repeal any provision of this act is hereby reserved to the Congress.

Now, you lawyers, is not that a wonderful provision? When we pass this law we, the Congress, are reserving the right for some Congress hereafter to alter, amend, or repeal its provisions. That power already is given to this Congress and every subsequent Congress by the Constitution of the United States, and you do not have to pass a law for it.

Why, it would be just as futile and ridiculous to attach this provision reading just the reverse of that. Suppose it read that "hereafter no Congress should have the right to alter, amend, or repeal any of the provisions of this act." That would have been just as wise. Why, it would not be worth the paper that it was written on, for no subsequent Congress would pay any attention to it.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I think the gentleman from Texas made a statement that he did not intend to make when he said that he had tried to protect certain Members of the House from having the heat turned on them on certain bills, and that that is why he has been filibustering against some of these bills.

Mr. BLANTON. I did not say that. I said I led the fight on some measures.

Mr. SADOWSKI. That the gentleman tried to protect other Members.

Mr. BLANTON. I said that I had taken the lead and made a fight because somebody had to and I could do it with less loss to myself than any other man in the House.

I cannot yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas declines to yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Let me read you something else in this bill. I ask my money-saving friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] to listen to this:

Each commissioner shall receive a salary of \$5,000 a year, payable semimonthly.

A little old tacky rent commission here with commissioners to draw \$5,000 a year each. That seems small to some people, but, after all, \$5,000 is a pretty good salary. I quote further:

The commission shall appoint a secretary, who shall receive a salary of \$3,000 a year.

Secretary for a rent commission to receive \$3,000 a year. Do gentlemen know that there is one Governor of a State who gets only \$3,500 a year?

And an attorney who shall receive a salary of \$3,500 a year, payable in like manner.

And here is another provision:

It (the commission) may appoint and remove such other officers, examiners, engineers, appraisers, attorneys, employees, and agents, and make such expenditures for rent, printing, telegrams, telephones, law books, books of reference, periodicals, furniture, stationery, office equipment, and other supplies and expenses as may be necessary to the administration of this act.

Who is to determine what is "necessary"? This "two-bit" rent commission will have an army of employees down there as sure as you are sitting in those seats, and many will be drawing six and eight and ten thousand dollars a year before it is over, and you then cannot stop them. Oh, it has been said that Congress will control that through the Committee on Appropriations. Your Committee on Appropriations is nothing in the world but a servant of this House. It is under the orders of the House. It can do only what this House authorizes it to do, and under the provisions of law and under common decency, when legislatively the Congress creates a commission and authorizes it to employ people and to incur expenses, and there is no limitation placed upon it by Congress, that commission can make any kind of contract with employees it wants to and in my experience in watching public affairs many years, every time the commission makes a contract, where you have given them the authority, I do not care what it costs, the Congress is going to make that contract of the Government good.

That is the reason this bill ought not to pass even if it were constitutional. My friend, the splendid constitutional lawyer, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DOBBS] made a fine speech a moment ago showing you absolutely that this bill is unconstitutional. What is the use of passing a bill when we lawyers know it is unconstitutional, which sets up a commission that will spend a lot of money, and instead of lowering rents will increase them and which will then finally go to the Supreme Court at great expense in preparing records and hiring attorneys, and then having the Supreme Court knock it out? That is a futile thing, a foolish thing. I am not going to be a party to it, and as long as I am a Member of this House, when a bill like this is brought in, I do not care who brings it in, I do not care who is its author, I do not care who is the committee chairman, I am going to oppose it with all the vigor in my being in order to stop it.

Because my friend from New York [Mr. TABER] and I took the lead on last District day in trying to stop this bill, the one in charge of it said on the floor by way of lecture and by way of castigation, if you please, because we had some roll calls, that they cost a tremendous sum of money. We, who are posted here, know that such roll calls do not cost a cent. These roll calls today do not cost a single cent. Everyone connected with them is on an annual salary. The Members who answer are on an annual salary, and they get the same pay whether they answer the roll call or are playing golf or attending to office business or are at the departments downtown or are at the Bowie races or at the ball game tomorrow.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I regret I have not the time. They get the same salary, the Chairman gets the same salary, the employees of the House get the same salary, and, while drawing our salaries, we better be doing something that is worth while than something that is futile. It is futile to pass this bill, it is expensive to pass this bill, it will cost a lot of money, it will be turned down eventually by the Supreme Court because it is unconstitutional.

Why should we not have a few roll calls to try to stop a bill like that rather than sit here and spend our time passing this expensive worthless bill? That is self-evident on its face. After that ridiculous statement about roll calls costing money came out in the Record and went down to Texas and up to New Jersey I got a letter from a man in New Jersey, who wrote me one of the most congratulatory

letters I have ever received in my life. He did not know me, but he called me "Tom." Said, "Tom, if what you did in stopping that bill did cost money, do it again, and we will pay for it." He said, "I think you rendered the country one of the most valuable day's services you ever rendered when you and Mr. TABER stopped that bill."

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry. I cannot.

I can take all these little flings when I know I am right. When I know I am doing my duty under my oath I do not care what people say, as long as I know that the constituents down home do not have to come up here and watch me. They have confidence in me. Because I voted for SAM RAYBURN's death sentence against unlawful public utilities, the unlawful kind of public utilities have financed one opponent against me down in my district, and I am told he has been campaigning for some time. Because I made the first speech on this floor against the Townsend plan, the Townsends' national leaders have financed an opponent, who, I am told, has been campaigning against me for some time. Last week, over my district, the newspapers reported that the Townsends had sent one of their special men from Washington, a Mr. Adams, whom I have never seen or heard of, and he was making speeches over my district, organizing Townsend clubs.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No. I am sorry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I thank you kindly. [Applause.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for this bill, if and when it comes to a final vote. I want to take exception to one remark made by the gentleman who just preceded me, where he claimed credit for fighting the battles of a lot of Members who, in their districts, figured their contest would be so close that they did not dare to take an active position in this particular battle. I, for one, resented the remark, because at no time since I have been here have I been compromised in the judgment exercised in a vote by feeling that somebody at home would oppose it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, objection has been raised that the bill violates the "due process" clause of the Constitution. If the commission is set up, it should have all the power and authority necessary to carry out its functions and duties. It provides that any person who believes himself injured by a ruling of the commission may seek aid in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia or any district court of the United States. Therefore there is no violation of such clause. Such procedure follows that which has been set up and judicially recognized as being constitutional in various Government agencies. For example, the Department of Agriculture, in connection with the pure-food laws, the cattle-dipping law, and so forth. It is purely an administrative set-up.

Then the rights and privileges of tenants are entitled to just as much consideration as are the rights and privileges of, say, corporations. The purpose of the judicial system is to insure that all persons, regardless of their financial position in life, shall be accorded just and equitable treatment under the law.

This bill does not give the commissioners power to break leases. Although the commission may find that the rent is too high, it is for the court to finally determine whether a lease may be broken.

The reply of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ELLENBOGEN] regarding the amount of money to be spent by the commission should be satisfactory. The maximum is limited in the bill to \$50,000, and its appropriations must have the approval of the proper committee of Congress. The subcommittee on appropriations for the District of Columbia surely would not allow any such expenditure as

the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] alleges. The proponents of this bill only desire to have the rent payers protected. It is not expected that the commission will act as a "pork barrel" in paying salaries and doing nothing else.

The able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] admits that rental conditions here are bad by his statement that the only way to cure the rental situation is by decentralization. Decentralization is a slow process, but, should it take place to a considerable extent, and a rent commission no longer be needed, those who are now opposing it may then have the pleasure of terminating it.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill, unlike most District bills, does affect every single Member of Congress. The members of the District Committee must necessarily do a great amount of work which does not mean anything to the United States as a whole, but in this instance we are presenting a bill for the benefit of our friends and yours, and probably there is no Member of Congress who does not have constituents paying rent that they are unable to pay. We believe this bill is in their interest, and especially so in the case of people receiving salaries of \$1,260, \$1,440, \$1,680, and all of the other low brackets, as the rents are now entirely out of proportion to their income.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield? Mrs. NORTON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to know if the expenses and salaries of this commission are to come out of the funds of the District of Columbia?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes, indeed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein a few of the hundreds of letters received by me, some very pathetic. Also letters from the International Association of Machinists, Lodge No. 174, with a membership of 4,300, the Washington Central Labor Union, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, accompanying a petition signed by 11,500 residents of the District, nearly all of whom are Government employees.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The letters referred to are as follows:

COLUMBIA LODGE, No. 174,
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1936.

The Honorable MARY T. NORTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM: Columbia Lodge, No. 174, International Association of Machinists, with a membership of 4,300 working in various Government departments in the District of Columbia, unanimously endorse the enclosed resolution at its last regular meeting, and instructed me to send you a copy.

Yours very truly,

T. J. LYNCH,
Recording Secretary.

RESOLUTION NO. 1—RENT CONTROL

Whereas landlords have taken advantage of the housing shortage in Washington and have increased rents to an unfair, exorbitant, and confiscatory level; and

Whereas such exploitation by landlords lowers the standard of living of workers, leaving less of their wages for food, clothing, medical care, and other necessities of life: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this organization endorses and urges the immediate passage of H. R. 11563, introduced in the Seventy-fourth session of the United States Congress by Hon. HENRY ELLENBOGEN, Pennsylvania, providing for a rent commission to determine fair rentals after conducting public hearings; and be it further

Resolved, That this organization favors three amendments to H. R. 11563:

1. Labor and tenant groups shall be represented on the commission.

2. In no case shall rents be higher than on January 1, 1934.

3. The effective term of this legislation shall be indefinite, to be terminated by the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate, at the end of the existing emergency.

And be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Congressman ELLENBOGEN, the District Committee of the United States Senate, the District Committee of the United States House of Representatives, and to the Washington Central Labor Union committee on rents and low-cost housing.

COLUMBIA LODGE, No. 174,
N. P. WEATHERSBY, President.
T. J. LYNCH, Secretary.

MARCH 24, 1936.

RESOLUTION NO. 2—HOUSING REGULATION

Whereas a large percentage of the rented dwellings in Washington are in very bad condition and lack necessary facilities for health, sanitation, and safety; and

Whereas existing laws and their enforcement are inadequate to compel landlords to improve conditions and provide the above-mentioned facilities: Be it

Resolved, therefore, That this organization urges Congress to establish a housing commission which shall be responsible for the enforcement of building inspection and condemnation, sanitation, health and fire protection regulations; and be it further

Resolved, That this commission shall—

1. Be composed of suitable representatives of Government, organized labor, and tenant groups;

2. Make available to Congress and the public detailed data on housing conditions and needs in the District, educating the public as to its rights and duties;

3. Recommend to Congress the enactment of laws and regulations compatible with modern standards of living; and

4. Settle landlord and tenant disputes arising from violations of housing laws and regulations.

And be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the District Committee of the United States Senate, the District Committee of the United States House of Representatives, and to the Washington Central Labor Union committee on rents and low-cost housing.

COLUMBIA LODGE, No. 174,
N. P. WEATHERSBY, President.
T. J. LYNCH, Secretary.

MARCH 24, 1936.

RESOLUTION NO. 3—LOW-RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION

Whereas, it is generally recognized that the dwellings available to the majority of workers in the District of Columbia are sub-standard, obsolete, and grossly inadequate; and

Whereas, despite the acute housing shortage, the great majority of building workers are still unemployed due to inability of private enterprise to supply new or modern dwellings at rents within the means of the average worker; and

Whereas, an active, unified, and informed demand on the part of workers and tenants, led by organized labor in the District of Columbia, is the only force that can initiate and promote a permanent public housing policy for the District of Columbia: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this organization urges Congress to create a District of Columbia housing authority, which shall be responsible for the construction of sufficient low-rental housing to meet the present shortage and to replace existing unfit habitations; and be it further

Resolved, That the policy of the authority shall be to initiate a comprehensive long-term program of public construction to include not only housing, but also educational, recreational, and other community facilities; and be it further

Resolved, That the housing program of the authority shall be based on the following fundamental principles:

1. That the financing, construction, ownership, and management shall be carried out by the authority on a completely public basis, and that the funds shall be provided from the Federal Treasury; and

2. That it shall be mandatory upon the authority to provide sufficient dwelling units to meet the need, in addition to the replacement of those demolished, within 10 years after the enactment of this legislation; and

3. That all labor employed in the planning, administration, construction, and maintenance shall be paid prevailing union and/or civil-service rates, and shall work under union conditions; and

4. That rents shall be based only on the cost of maintenance plus a charge to cover the cost of municipal services, but in no case shall rents be more than \$6 per month per room; and

5. That organized labor and tenant groups shall be adequately represented on the authority, and that each of the housing projects shall be administered by a civil-service manager in cooperation with a committee of the tenants; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the District Committees of the United States Senate, the House of Representatives, and the rent and low-cost housing committee of the Washington Central Labor Union.

COLUMBIA LODGE, No. 174,
N. P. WEATHERSBY, President.
T. J. LYNCH, Secretary.

MARCH 24, 1936.

WASHINGTON CENTRAL LABOR UNION,
COMMITTEE ON RENTS AND LOW COST HOUSING,
March 22, 1936.

MARY T. NORTON,
Chairman, House District Committee,
United States Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. NORTON: Attached hereto are many copies of a petition signed by 10,000 residents of Washington endorsing H. R. 11563, the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act. The signatures on this petition, numbering approximately 10,000, were secured by members of our committee and their friends during the last 3 days.

The petition reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, residents of the District of Columbia, suffering from exorbitant rents and distressing inadequate housing conditions, heartily endorse the District of Columbia Emergency

Rent Act, bill H. R. 11563, which provides for a rent commission empowered to establish fair rents."

We believe that the large number of signatures secured by our committee clearly shows the strong sentiment of Washington citizens that the constant rise of rents must stop.

We are also enclosing a description of some of the rent complaints submitted to our grievance committee by residents, and a résumé of the results of a questionnaire circulated recently by our committee in collaboration with the Resettlement Administration.

We sincerely hope that this material will be of value to you in your presentation of argument in behalf of the Ellenbogen rent-control bill on the floor of the House tomorrow.

Yours truly,

HENRY RHINE,
Executive Secretary.

UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS,
AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1936.

DISTRICT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: This is to certify that Carpenters' Local Union, No. 1590, of Washington, D. C., has endorsed the enclosed resolutions sponsored by the rent and low-cost-housing committee of the Washington Central Labor Union.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH G. VIEAU, Recording Secretary.

RESOLUTION NO. 1—RENT CONTROL

Whereas landlords have taken advantage of the housing shortage in Washington and have increased rents to an unfair, exorbitant, and confiscatory level; and

Whereas such exploitation by landlords lowers the standard of living of workers, leaving less of their wages for food, clothing, medical care, and other necessities of life: Be it

Resolved, therefore, That this organization endorses and urges the immediate passage of H. R. 3809, introduced in the seventy-fourth session of the United States Congress by Hon. HENRY ELLENBOGEN, Pennsylvania, providing for a rent commission to determine fair rentals after conducting public hearings; and be it further

Resolved, That this organization favors three amendments to H. R. 3809:

1. Labor and tenant groups shall be represented on the Commission.

2. In no case shall rents be higher than on January 1, 1934.

3. The effective term of this legislation shall be indefinite, to be terminated by the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate, at the end of the existing emergency.

And be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Congressman ELLENBOGEN, the District Committee of the United States Senate, the District Committee of the United States House of Representatives, and to the Washington Central Labor Union committee on rents and low-cost housing.

CARPENTERS' LOCAL UNION No. 1590.
J. R. Cox, President.
JOSEPH G. VIEAU, Secretary.

FEBRUARY 11, 1936.

RESOLUTION NO. 2—HOUSING REGULATION

Whereas a large percentage of the rented dwellings in Washington are in very bad condition and lack necessary facilities for health, sanitation, and safety; and

Whereas existing laws and their enforcement are inadequate to compel landlords to improve conditions and provide the above-mentioned facilities: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this organization urges Congress to establish a housing commission which shall be responsible for the enforcement of building inspection and condemnation, sanitation, health, and fire-protection regulations; and be it further

Resolved, That this commission shall—

1. Be composed of suitable representatives of Government, organized labor, and tenant groups;

2. Make available to Congress and the public detailed data on housing conditions and needs in the District, educating the public as to its rights and duties;

3. Recommend to Congress the enactment of laws and regulations compatible with modern standards of living; and

4. Settle landlord and tenant disputes arising from violations of housing laws and regulations.

And be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the District Committee of the United States Senate, the District Committee of the United States House of Representatives, and to the Washington Central Labor Union committee on rents and low-cost housing.

CARPENTERS' LOCAL UNION, No. 1590,
J. R. Cox, President.
JOSEPH G. VIEAU, Secretary.

FEBRUARY 11, 1936.

RESOLUTION NO. 3—LOW-RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION

Whereas it is generally recognized that the dwellings available to the majority of workers in the District of Columbia are substandard, obsolete, and grossly inadequate; and

Whereas, despite the acute housing shortage, the great majority of building workers are still unemployed due to inability of pri-

vate enterprise to supply new or modern dwellings at rents within the means of the average worker; and

Whereas an active, unified, and informed demand on the part of workers and tenants, led by organized labor in the District of Columbia, is the only force that can initiate and promote a permanent public housing policy for the District of Columbia: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this organization urges Congress to create a District of Columbia housing authority which shall be responsible for the construction of sufficient low-rent housing to meet the present shortage and to replace existing unfit habitations; and be it further

Resolved, That the policy of the authority shall be to initiate a comprehensive long-term program of public construction to include not only housing, but also educational, recreational, and other community facilities, and be it further

Resolved, That the housing program of the authority shall be based on the following fundamental principles:

1. That the financing, construction, ownership, and management shall be carried out by the authority on a completely public basis, and that the funds shall be provided from the Federal Treasury, and

2. That it shall be mandatory upon the authority to provide sufficient dwelling units to meet the need, in addition to the replacement of those demolished, within 10 years after the enactment of this legislation, and

3. That all labor employed in the planning, administration, construction, and maintenance shall be paid prevailing union and/or civil-service rates, and shall work under union conditions, and

4. That rents shall be based only on the cost of maintenance plus a charge to cover the cost of municipal services, but in no case shall rents be more than \$6 per month per room, and

5. That organized labor and tenant groups shall be adequately represented on the authority, and that each of the housing projects shall be administered by a civil-service manager in cooperation with a committee of the tenants.

And be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the District Committees of the United States Senate, the House of Representatives, and the rent and low-cost housing committee of the Washington Central Labor Union.

CARPENTERS' LOCAL UNION, No. 1590,
J. R. Cox, President,
JOSEPH G. VIEAU, Secretary.

FEBRUARY 11, 1936.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington.

HON. MARY T. NORTON,

House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MRS. NORTON: I do hope that you can put through some kind of rent-control legislation before Congress adjourns. All of Washington business people, both commercial and professional, graft off the Government clerks, but the rental people are the worst of the worst. At least, the others realize that they depend upon us for their living and are courteous to us.

I live in an apartment at the corner of Thirteenth and I Streets NW., a west apartment, and have been trying for the past 2 months to have my awnings put up. We received a notice in May that they were going to paint the building on the outside, which means around the window casings. I have been in the apartment for the past 7 years, and this is the first time any outside painting has been done. Since they let it go that long, it does seem that they could put it off until fall. However, no consideration is given the tenants.

After the sun has been pouring in that west apartment all afternoon, no matter how tired I am after work, I cannot go home. I have to go to the movies or some other place to keep cool. It is not possible to raise the blinds or open the windows until about 7 o'clock. I have a gas refrigerator, and the tremendous heat causes it to consume twice as much gas, and the more gas consumed, the more heat from the refrigerator. No matter how I feel I cannot stay home a day, and on Sundays I have to leave the apartment right after noon, when the sun starts shining in. In addition to this, my furniture covers and draperies are fading so that they are not fit to look at. I have told the resident manager all of this, also have talked to the realty company, Weaver Bros., but to no avail. They either make promises that are never kept or are too bored to talk to me. They have the "take it or leave it" attitude. They know that it is not possible to find a vacant apartment, especially one which I can afford to keep.

I hear reports on all sides of me about the attitude the realty people are taking since it is so easy for them to rent. One of the ladies in my office and her sister, also a Government worker, occupied an apartment on Rhode Island Avenue NW., four-floor apartment building. They had lived there 2½ years, and since it had not been newly renovated when they moved in, this spring they asked to have it done over. The resident manager refused, and a few days later, the 1st of May, the janitor handed them a notice to vacate by the 1st of June, stating that the apartment had been rented to another party. They are well-bred, quiet ladies and had never been in arrears in their rent. There was no excuse offered, but they were advised that they could have a fourth-floor apartment, the top floor. One of the other tenants told these sisters that the resident manager had a son and his wife on the fourth floor and they wanted a cooler apartment for the summer. This

tenant also advised them that they were no sooner out of the apartment than it was entirely renovated and the son and his wife moved from the fourth floor to the vacated apartment. One of these ladies called the owner of the apartment at the Shoreham Hotel and was advised by his secretary that they stood back of the resident manager in everything. She would not even listen to her story. They tramped all over town for days, using their annual leave, which is so scarce now, before they could find a place to live. Finally found an apartment in the northeast section.

You have always been a friend to the Government clerks, and I do hope that you will lend your efforts to this cause, as we all feel that just as soon as Congress adjourns rents will go sky high, and there is nothing to prevent them from renting right over our heads to higher bidders.

The real estate people of Washington are a flock of pirates, and we will be at their mercy when they are no longer afraid of having a rent-control bill. We need a rent law with real teeth in it here.

Thanking you in anticipation, I am,
Very truly yours,

(Miss) JESSIE M. MURPHY,
1228 Eye Street NW., Apartment 910.

FEBRUARY 3, 1936.

Mrs. MARY NORTON, M. C.

MY DEAR MRS. NORTON: It has come to my attention that you are interesting yourself in the exorbitant rents which are now being charged by landlords in Washington, D. C.

I moved into a three-room first-floor apartment at no. 18 Ninth Street NE. 3 years ago (June 1933), paying \$50 per month. In October of that year my rent was raised to \$55. This past October, 1935, the rent was advanced to \$60, which, by an argument with the owner, he finally compromised on \$57.50. The first of this month I was informed that my rent would be raised \$5 more, making a total of \$62.50. There has not been one cent's repairs or improvements spent on that apartment since I moved there in June 1933, still the rent soars higher and higher. I spent all Saturday afternoon and yesterday (Sunday) looking for a suitable and decent place, but the prices were shocking. I found a three-room apartment in the 300 block of Second Street NE. for \$72.50 and a four-room one in the same building for \$82.50. I traveled over on South Carolina Avenue SE., found a two-room apartment, no electric refrigeration—only heat—rent, \$60.

This rental situation has gotten to the point that we Government people are forced into filthy, dirty places, and made to pay these terrible rents while these property hogs are reaping a harvest from us, and after the rent is paid you have nothing left in case of sickness or other unexpected expenses. It's an outrage to have such a practice continue, and surely there is something some of you people in Congress can do to curb these unreasonable rents and make these property owners come down within the means of an average-salaried person.

There has been one investigation after another, and that seems to be as far as it goes. I appeal to you in the name of every Government employee in this District of Columbia, For God's sake do something and put a stop to this highway robbery.

Hoping that this may meet with your approval, I am,
Very respectfully,

MARIE F. MONK
(1208—Navy Department).

1815 S STREET, NW.,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1936.

Re: Rental increase, 1815 S Street, NW.

Mrs. MARY T. NORTON,
Chairman, House District Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. NORTON: The undersigned is a tenant in the above apartment house of which F. M. Pratt Co., Inc., is agent. Attached hereto is copy of a letter received January 31, 1936, similar copies of which have been given the other tenants in said apartment house.

A telephone call was made to the office, since no plausible reason was given for raising the rent, asking just why this step was being taken. I was advised in an unbusiness-like manner by an official, who was said to be Mr. Pratt, "We just want more money."

If there is anything you can do in this matter, or any advice that you can give, I will be grateful to you. I feel that the rent, which I am paying for a one-room apartment, is unreasonable; then to receive a notice to the effect that it is being increased seems to be taking an unfair advantage of the tenants.

Your advice, if deemed advisable, will be kept confidential, and any assistance appreciated.

Very truly yours,

GLADYS E. AUGUSTIN.

F. M. PRATT CO., INC.,
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1936.

Re: Rental adjustment, apartment no. 304, 1815 S Street NW.

MISS GLADYS AUGUSTIN,
Apartment No. 304, 1815 S Street NW.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MISS AUGUSTIN: Please be advised that we have been requested by the owner of the above-captioned premises to advise you that the monthly rental on these premises will be adjusted

to \$32.50 per month, beginning with the rent due March 1, 1936, for the month ending March 31, 1936.

In view of the present conditions and considering the location and desirability of this property, we feel that this adjustment is very fair.

You are therefore requested to execute the enclosed monthly rental agreement and return same to this office at your earliest convenience.

Yours very truly,

F. M. PRATT CO., INC.,
By F. M. PRATT, President.

DECEMBER 10, 1935.

HON. MARY NORTON,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. NORTON: In reading over the Washington papers, I note that you are interesting yourself in the rent problems in the District, and felt that my case might interest you, as I feel that it is a particularly glaring example of exorbitant rent.

My husband was appointed to a position with the Securities and Exchange Commission about 3 months ago and I came down for a few days with the intention of renting a furnished apartment. I tramped from one end of Washington, and outlying districts, to the other without finding a single apartment at a reasonable rental, or, in fact, at any rental. I found exactly two vacancies, one of which was refused to me because of my young son. Finally in desperation I took the one I now have—two rooms, a small kitchen, and bath, and the rental is \$116 per month, and we were compelled to sign a year's lease in the bargain, which, in my opinion, is nothing more than gouging. Gas and electricity is included in the rent.

The apartment is in a court; we never see the sun, finding it necessary to have the lights turned on all day long. In fact, we can't even see the street from our rooms because of a long roof over the lobby just below our windows. The furniture is old and of the very cheapest quality. No linens, dishes, or silver are supplied.

But the worst of all is the fact that I firmly believe that living here is positively unhealthy, as the baby, who never had a cold in all his 4½ years of life, has been constantly suffering with a cold since we live here, and I have no doubt that it is due to the stuffy, poorly lighted, and badly ventilated apartment.

Since the rental we are paying is well over a third of my husband's monthly salary, and isn't worth anything like that price, you can readily understand how welcome the news of your interest in the rent situation was, and I felt that if I wrote to you you might possibly have a solution to our problem. Anything you can do will certainly be greatly appreciated by me.

Very truly yours,

MARIE E. SPRAGUE,
Apt. 213, 1025 Connecticut Avenue,
Washington, D. C.

1830 K STREET NW., APARTMENT 607,
Washington, D. C., November 8, 1935.

HON. MARY T. NORTON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. NORTON: As you are chairman of the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives, I am taking the liberty to address this letter to you.

I know you are very much interested in the welfare of the residents of the District and that you worked so hard last year to get some legislation enacted by Congress to protect tenants from the high rents which have been imposed upon them by the real-estate people and property owners of Washington. We were all so sorry that in the closing days of Congress pressure was brought to bear by the real-estate board to prevent such legislation from becoming law.

I have personally—with many hundreds of others—been one of the victims this past summer, and am writing this to urge you and others interested to again present this matter at the opening of the next Congress.

I live at the above address and have for the past 15 months. I am alone, have a very small one-room, bath, and pullman kitchen—by this I mean it is only large enough to stand in and without any window—for which I paid \$35.50 per month, which was all it was worth. Last June the building was sold, and since that time it has been in the hands of new agents as well—McKeever & Co., of this city. The 1st of October we were notified that beginning November 1st rents would be advanced 20 percent. This I consider an exorbitant rent for that type apartment—a monthly rental of \$42.50. We not only were notified of a raise in rent, but all tenants either forced into signing a yearly lease or asked to move out. In many cases the agents have been very disagreeable about it. Last night only one lady tenant who had not signed her lease, but who had paid the advanced rent and said nothing, was notified by the office that unless she signed her lease by Saturday, November 9 they would consider that she intended to move and they would rent her apartment to someone else.

I, for one, spent nearly every moment I could during the month of October trying to locate elsewhere. The whole thing seems hopeless, though—practically as bad as during the time of the World War—as there are no vacancies any place. Practically every building in the downtown section has increased its rent anywhere from \$5 to \$10 on one-room apartment, and on up, according to the size of the unit. Some, of course, have been less,

but, on the whole, they average about the same. It seems to be a well-organized "racket", as when one building increases rents, all others seem to follow very soon.

I can certainly see no reason for this and truly hope that you will use all your influence to have legislation passed to protect those of us who are living on small salaries, and who are at the mercy of greedy landlords of Washington. All rents in Washington seem to be based on the Government workers' salary, and, as soon as their salary cuts were restored, the rents started going up. Unfortunately, though, all residents of Washington are not Government workers, and many have had no restoration of salary cuts. I, for one, am not a Government worker and have not had a full restoration of the very large salary cut of several years ago. It does not seem fair, do you think, to have to pay one-third of your salary for a roof over your head?

I trust that an opportunity may be given the tenants of Washington to come before the committee and present their problems when Congress convenes.

Anything you can do in regard to this matter will certainly be very much appreciated, as has what you have tried to do in the past.

Respectfully yours,

(Miss) DORETTA TAYLOR.

J. A. McKEEVER Co.,
Washington, D. C., October 1, 1935.

MISS PEGGY SHAW,
1830 K Street NW., apartment 304, City.

DEAR MADAM: Beginning on the 1st of November it will be necessary to make a slight upward revision in the rentals of the Willsonia and your rent beginning on that date will be the amount specified in the enclosed lease. Kindly sign the lease and return it either to the resident manager or to this office.

Very truly yours,

J. A. McKEEVER Co.,
By H. N. HARVEY.

FEBRUARY 10, 1936.

Mrs. MARY NORTON,
Chairman, District Committee, U. S. Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. NORTON: I am enclosing herewith a letter I received from J. A. McKeever Co.

I have been a resident of the Willsonia Apartment since 1930. For the past several years my rental has been \$35 per month. The "slight upward revision" referred to in the enclosed letter was an increase of over 20 percent. My rent was raised from \$35 per month to \$42.50 per month.

We do not feel that it was at all necessary to increase the rent in this apartment building, and we will appreciate your investigation.

Thanking you, I am

Yours respectfully,

1830 K STREET NW., Washington, D. C.

PEGGY SHAW.

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 13, 1935.

HON. MARY NORTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. NORTON: After reading in Monday's Star that you probably would not call up the bill to revive the rent commission, I am enclosing this advertisement from Saturday's Star. This apartment was rented to a friend of mine less than 2 years ago for \$45. Last fall the rent was raised to \$47.50. Last week the tenant moved out and here is the proof that the rent has been raised to \$55. Now, don't you think we need a rent commission?

I rent from this same firm and I am sure they are only waiting for Congress to adjourn before they raise the rent on every apartment.

Working people can no longer find a place to live at a reasonable rent.

I hope for the sake of the low-salaried people that Congress will pass this bill and not drive me and others to live in a neighborhood unfit for decent people.

Yours respectfully,

(Mrs.) E. A. WHIPP.

[Evening Star, Aug. 10, 1935]

4403 14th Street, N.W.: Two rooms, kitchen, bath, \$55. Electric refrigeration. (This refrigeration is not on the house current.)

H. GRADY GORE & Co.,
Washington, D. C., May 31, 1935.

Mrs. MAY D. KNOTT,
Apartment 64, 921 Nineteenth Street NW.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM: This is to advise that I am adjusting the rental schedule for the Cambridge Apartments, and that beginning July 1, 1935, the rental of the apartment which you occupy will be \$47.50 per month.

I wish to take this opportunity of expressing to you my appreciation of you as a tenant and trust that we may have the opportunity of continuing to serve you.

Very truly yours,

H. GRADY GORE.

921 NINETEENTH STREET NW., APARTMENT NO. 1,

Washington, D. C., February 3, 1936.

HON. MARY T. NORTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. NORTON: As you are making a private investigation of the rent situation here in the District, I am enclosing a copy of a letter received by me as a notification of an increase in my rent, for your information in this connection.

This represents an increase of 20 percent over the original rent for one-room, kitchenette, and bath apartment on the back of the building. The front apartments were increased even more. I had just recovered from rather a severe illness, following an operation at the time, and was unable to do much looking around for a more reasonable place. There were no vacancies in any small apartments near me. As a result I found it necessary to take a bachelor apartment in the same building renting for \$40 per month, which had been increased from \$30. This consists of one room and bath, with lights, telephone, etc., extra. This is more rent than I can afford to pay, but as you probably know, the city is so overcrowded that it is next to impossible to find anything in a convenient location. This is what the real-estate people are taking advantage of.

I trust that some way may be found to have the rents of Washington reduced, so that the small-salaried people may be able to have living accommodations at reasonable rates.

Very sincerely yours,

(Mrs.) MAY D. KNOTT.

1420 HARVARD STREET NW.,
Washington, D. C., January 22, 1936.

HON. MARY T. NORTON,
Chairman, House District Committee,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM: I am writing to you to ask you to please help the people who rent apartments.

It is imperative that I move, and for 3 months I have been searching for a three-room, kitchen, and bath apartment. I demand a clean apartment, and it must be in a respectable neighborhood. I have a boy, and I don't want him to play with any "Tom, Dick, or Harry." I'm not a snob—far from it—but I want my boy to be a good American citizen.

We can't pay \$55-\$65. I don't think I am unreasonable in expecting to pay \$40. Unfurnished, at that.

I certainly am hoping you will really take some drastic steps and demand a change, as we certainly are "betting on you." You are our only hope. If you will help us, there certainly will be many grateful Washingtonians.

Don't forget, "What benefits one benefits all", and the "Hill" people will also get a reduction in their rents.

Hopeful,

Mrs. D. CHILDS.

DUDDINGTON APARTMENTS, No. 32,
1754 Lanier Place NW.

HON. MARY T. NORTON,
No. 343, House Office Building.

MY DEAR MRS. NORTON: You asked for information concerning rents.

My husband gets \$29.73 per week. We pay \$50 per month rent. That leaves \$10 for groceries, which includes the milk, 60 cents a month for the paper. The remainder of the income must provide \$2.50 for gas and electricity and church giving, clothes, doctors, and other emergencies, also two \$1 passes.

We are five in family, 2 adults and 3 children, ranging from 8 to 14. All three children attend school.

All the economic budgeteers say only one-third of the income should be spent on rent. We spend a little more than half. In the rent we have heat, water, and Frigidaire. The apartment is well kept, but old.

We had to take an apartment. We couldn't rent a five-room house anywhere within the District line for less than \$75 or \$85 per month, and then we would have had to furnish heat, light, and Frigidaire extra.

We have three rooms besides the kitchen and bath. Every room has to have bed. We have fairly good-sized rooms. So many houses are not big enough for a family of five, even if the rent were not prohibitive. I think Washington should make provisions for families of five so that rent would be for at least \$40 a month.

In many of the leading cities of the United States a five-room house with modern conveniences can be had for \$25 or \$30 a month. I know that for a fact because my husband worked on these relief schedules—several cities showed modern houses, five rooms, \$25 a month.

A five-room house last year could be had for \$50 and some six-room houses were available last year at \$55, but houses that rented \$50 last year have been boosted to \$60 and \$75.

I think the rents should be made to go down. The landlords should be compelled to lower rents. People here in Washington think, oh, well, they are working for the Government and they must have some place to live so we will ask whatever we want and they'll have to pay it.

Yours sincerely, hoping you may find some satisfactory solution,

Mrs. I. D. JOHNSTON,
1754 Lanier Place.

WASHINGTON, January 29, 1936.

MY DEAR MRS. NORTON: I do wish you would see the rents to be lowered in this city real soon as I am living in the Northwest and have no convenience for my money—the rent I am paying.

I have three rooms, no private bath, no sink for cooking in my rooms. I have to get all the cooking water in the bathroom, which you know is not sanitary, not healthful, and have to pay \$15 a room, unfurnished. You know that is a ridiculous price for unfurnished rooms. Five or eight dollars for one unfurnished room should be more than enough to charge poor people, and I know some that have two rooms have to pay the same \$15 for one unfurnished room, please, and I tell you from Fourth and D Streets NW. to H Street NW., the same on Third Street NW. are charging the same money and no convenience at all. Please, dear madam, see that we get more convenience and less rent to pay. From Third and D Street NW. to Third and H Street NW. are large rooming houses and they make the poor people pay whatever they like or have no rooms. They claim they have high taxes to pay. Why two or three rooms at \$15 a room would pay all the taxes and gas, light, and electric lights, and then they have money left over—plenty of it—and they usually have the best floor themselves—first floor. Please see that our unfurnished rooms will cost—I say about \$5 or \$8 for a room unfurnished.

Yours respectfully,

A CITIZEN.

1401 FAIRMONT STREET NW.,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1936.

DEAR MRS. NORTON: I am glad to learn from newspaper reports that you plan to take some action to improve the rental situation in the District. I am writing to you especially to bring to your attention the situation existing relative to the smaller apartments. The smaller apartments are in much greater demand than the larger ones, and property owners knowing that these apartments can be readily rented if vacated make no effort whatever to keep them in a livable condition. There is such a scarcity of small apartments that they refuse to make any repairs whatever without raising the rent five or ten dollars. They say they can get at least \$10 more for it if you move out. I know from others and from looking around that when an apartment is vacated that the rents are put up so high that the people of average salary cannot pay them. The high rents paid in dilapidated old buildings is appalling. They take advantage of the tenant because they know they cannot find another. This is the situation that confronts me in an apartment I rent from the Bliss properties, 1401 Fairmont Street, and practically all tenants of small apartments. They are a little less independent with the larger ones, as they are hard to rent. Those are the figures from which they base their percent of raising rents. I feel that a rent commission is the only thing that will remedy a situation like this.

Very truly yours,

HALLIE C. BEAR.

1460 IRVING STREET NW., APARTMENT 508,
January 17, 1936.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NORTON: I am interested in your program on rentals.

I wish to state I live in a small apartment at the above address and pay \$37.50. Rents are entirely too much in the District.

It seems they are taking advantage of the crowded city. There is no service here and the place is not kept up, having filthy steps and elevator.

Any time I shall be glad to have mine inspected.

I went to the west coast and realized when I returned how they take advantage here.

Thanking you for your interest,

Respectfully,

(Miss) BLANCHE RIDGEWAY.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 14, 1936.

HON. MARY T. NORTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. NORTON: I read with interest of your plan to investigate high rents in the District.

Something ought to be done to curb Washington landlords. I pay \$45 per month, not including gas and electricity, for a one-room, kitchenette apartment on the first floor. An adjoining building cuts out all light, and it is necessary to use electric lights constantly. A reasonable rental for this apartment would be \$30 a month. The rental agent is Jesse H. Hedges.

Accept our thanks for your intercession.

Sincerely,

EULA C. WHITE,
1750 Sixteenth Street NW.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 14, 1936.

HON. MARY T. NORTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. NORTON: May I add my voice to the increasing number of protesting citizens whose apartment rents have always been reasonably high in proportion to the standard Government salary, but which during the past 6 months have been increased?

My one-exposure, one-room, very small kitchen, bath, and balcony, up to October 1, rented for \$42.50, and now stands at \$47.50. For this amount the new owners appear unwilling to make even the slightest improvement, and, of course, will not consider redecoration.

Some action surely should be taken to prevent the necessity of those people who wish a clean, convenient, and high-type apartment finding it necessary to pay over one-third of their incomes for it.

Very sincerely yours,

CLAIRE W. SIMS,
1830 K Street NW., Apartment 602.

LXXX—345

1601 ARGONNE PLACE NW.,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1936.

HON. MADAM MARY T. NORTON,
Chairman, House District Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. NORTON: As the local newspapers have recently carried articles covering your interest in the rental situation existing in this city, I wish to supply you with the following facts in connection with my own experience:

About 2 years ago I approached the proprietor of the Chalfonte Apartment House Co., located at 1601 Argonne Place NW., and advised that the apartment I occupied was very objectionable on account of noise—being situated directly over the boiler room—and I felt the rent was excessive and would be compelled to move unless a reduction was made in the rent. As an outcome of that conference a new rental basis was agreed upon as fair for the apartment I occupy. This arrangement continued in effect until I received notice the latter part of last August—the notice being timed with the adjournment of Congress—that beginning October 1 a new schedule of rents would go into effect; in my case amounting to an increase of 27 percent.

Naturally I protested this excessive increase, advising the proprietors that we had agreed upon a fair rental and quote the following from a letter I wrote them at that time:

"What is the necessity existing at this time of forcing established tenants of the Chalfonte to seek other living quarters or else submit to increase of 27 percent?"

To briefly state the case, I continued my occupancy of the apartment under the impression that relief would be afforded the oppressed tenants at the next session of Congress.

I may state, in my opinion, many complaints of injustice would be brought to the attention of the proper authorities if the renters of Washington were not afraid of being blacklisted or other reprisals taken by landlords.

The above facts are submitted with the hope that they may be of assistance in bringing about a condition which will be equitable to both the lessor and lessee.

Sincerely yours,

J. I. LEE.

HOTEL ANNAPOLIS,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1936.

HON. MARY T. NORTON,
Chairman of the District Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. NORTON: The impudence of Representatives BLANTON and TABER is inconceivable.

I am a Government employee, and, like thousands of others, a victim of the greed of the landlords of this city.

During the last 3 years I have been renting a room at the Hotel Annapolis, paying \$45 a month. Last January a crowd of racketeers from New York (ex-managers of the Manger Hotel in New York) took possession of the Annapolis Hotel, and a month after all rents were increased from 25 to 50 percent. My room rent was increased from \$45 to \$65. Accommodations in Washington today are exploited by racketeers with kid gloves, taking advantage of the large number of Government employees residing in the city and the great influx of transients to the Capital during the spring season.

Your fight on behalf of the people of the District deserves the admiration, praise, and support of every honest and decent citizen.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE GAZZERA.

3430 CONNECTICUT AVENUE,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1936.

DEAR MRS. NORTON: This letter is what I received the day after the Ellenbogen bill failed because of Mr. BLANTON, Monday, the 16th.

I wish you could see what the realtors are gouging the people from the States for \$60; a hole in the wall and no upkeep and minimum taxes the world over.

I surely hope something can be done to make them be sensible and not too greedy. It is even said Congress is in the real-estate business now. I think a committee ought to visit some of these apartments and get first-hand information.

Hoping for passage of the Ellenbogen bill, I am,

Sincerely,

HUGH J. McLAUGHLIN.

P. S.—There are many others who think it is futile to fight back.

DIXIE REALTY CO., INC.,
NORTHEAST CORNER VERMONT AVENUE AT L STREET NW.,
Washington, D. C., March 23, 1936.

MR. HUGH J. McLAUGHLIN,
3430 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 21, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. McLAUGHLIN: We are directed to inform you by the owners of the building that the rental on the apartment you occupy \$52.50, shall be returned to the 1928 normal rate of \$60 per month, effective April 15, 1936.

We are, therefore, enclosing lease for 1 year at a rental of \$60 per month beginning April 15. Will you kindly sign both copies in the space provided and return them to us?

I will greatly appreciate it if you will take care of this matter within the next day or two.

Very truly yours,

FRANCIS C. SLEIGLE, President.

1812 K. STREET NW.,

Washington, D. C., Apartment 610, March 25, 1936.

Mrs. MARY T. NORTON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MRS. NORTON: May I commend you upon the valiant fight you have put forth for the rent-control bill in spite of determined opposition from Mr. BLANTON. It is encouraging to know that someone down on the hill is interested in the welfare of the Government clerks. I have been in Washington for over 18 years, and each year I have been hopeful that Congress would do something about the exorbitant rentals here, but so far nothing really has been done about it. Take the apartment which I occupy in the Pentilly Apartment at 1812 K Street, B. F. Saul Co. agents. When I took the apartment, which is a two-room, kitchen, and bath apartment, the rent was \$62.50 per month, exclusive of electricity and gas. On January 1, 1936, the rent was increased \$10.50 per month, making the monthly rental \$73, exclusive of electricity and gas. In addition, there is a charge of \$1 per month for telephone service and 5 cents for each call. I have looked everywhere for a more reasonable place to live, but so far have been unsuccessful.

I am asking my Congressman—Mr. GRISWOLD, of Indiana—to support this legislation when it comes up in the House for final disposition, and I am greatly in hopes that relief may be had at this time.

Regardless of the outcome, Mrs. NORTON, I wish personally to thank you for the time and effort you have put into this legislation.

Very sincerely,

HELEN L. MOORE.

FEDERATION OF ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS,
CHEMISTS, AND TECHNICIANS,
WOMEN'S AUXILIARY,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1936.

HON. MARY T. NORTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM: The Women's Auxiliary of the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians wholeheartedly endorses your active support of the rent bill for the District, H. R. 11563. We sincerely hope that your good work will bring favorable results.

We are vitally interested in housing and will do everything in our power to secure widespread support for this bill.

The need for a rent-control commission is so great in the District that its residents are backing you in your efforts to secure its passage.

Respectfully yours,

IRENE GAPIN,
Corresponding Secretary.

Mrs. NORTON. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ELLENBOGEN], such time as he may desire.

THE RENT-CONTROL BILL IS FAIR AND NECESSARY

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Chairman, I believe that in comparing the present bill with the previous rent-control bill for the District of Columbia, passed by the Congress, the amendments to the rent-control bill of 1919 have not been considered. If these amendments are considered it will be found that the bill now before the Committee of the Whole House is substantially similar to the rent-control bill of 1919, as amended, and to the rent-control bill for the State of New York, as amended. Most of the provisions of the bill now before the House have been taken either from the District of Columbia control bill of 1919, from the amendments thereto, or from the New York rent-control bill, as amended.

BOTH LANDLORDS AND TENANTS ARE PROTECTED

It is entirely incorrect to speak about taking the property away from the landlord. Under the bill, the rental must be so fixed that the landlord is allowed a fair and reasonable return upon the present value of the property. Surely no fair landlord wants more than a fair return upon a fair value of the property involved. On the other hand, the tenant will be protected against unfair and excessive rents.

The total expenditures of the commission are limited to \$50,000 under the bill, and the life of the commission is limited to 3 years under the terms of the bill.

This bill is just and fair. It is necessary. It should be passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS].

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, this has been quite an interesting bill. As it has progressed through the House there have been many sidelights injected into it. I intend, of course, to have nothing to say about that one way or the other. It is my opinion, however, that if this bill is

enacted into law it will be one law passed affecting the District of Columbia that could have an effect upon every constituent of yours who becomes resident in this District. If there are any Members of the House who feel they are not paying rent enough in the District of Columbia, then, of course, they should oppose the passage of this legislation. If there are any Members of the House who have secured employment for some of their constituents at salaries ranging from \$1,000 to \$2,000 and who feel these folks are not paying enough rent, then, of course, they should vote against this bill. But if you think your own rent is out of line with the rental you pay in your home city, then you should give this bill a chance and an opportunity to operate. If you think those clerks of the Government are paying rents exorbitant and out of proportion to the benefit received from the housing given them under the contract then, of course, I think you should support this legislation.

Is it constitutional? This has become a very close question on any law that is passed. I frankly state to you I do not know whether it is constitutional or not, but I think if I were to say it was constitutional my opinion on the matter would be just about as safe and sound as the opinion of any other lawyer or Member of this body. If the only reason you have for voting against this bill is doubt of its constitutionality then you are skating on a thin division, although I frankly say to you I do not know whether it is constitutional or not. If there is anything in this bill which will make it possible for country boys like me to come to Washington and live in an apartment, in a house, without paying five or six times as much for the same accommodations as they would pay in their home towns, they come within this bill. So support it and let us pass it and put it on the books, and leave the test of constitutionality with the courts which are so ready to assume it.

I can visualize the situation of clerks and stenographers. I have a couple in my office. I cannot pay them salaries enough to permit them to live in the way they have been accustomed to live at home because they cannot find a place cheap enough to live in.

The landlords, of course, say, "We have just got to charge these exorbitant rates because our overhead is so high on these buildings and our original investment is so high." I do not know about that, but I know that building conditions in Washington surely could not have been any worse than they were in any other great city of the United States. I know they have longer waiting lists for apartments in Washington than any other city with which I am acquainted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. UMSTEAD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 11563, declaring an emergency in the housing condition in the District of Columbia, creating a rent commission for the District of Columbia, prescribing powers and duties of the commission, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

THE MEMORY OF JEFFERSON

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered at the Jefferson Day dinner of the Sons of the Revolution by Hon. James M. Beck, president of the Washington chapter of the society, in Washington, on April 12, 1928:

Mr. Speaker, on both sides of the House, we have listened with great interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri on the life, work, and influence of Thomas Jefferson.

There are a few outstanding historic characters that are acclaimed by all Americans, regardless of partisan affiliation.

One of the finest of all tributes to Jefferson was pronounced a few years ago by our late colleague, James M. Beck, who died yesterday.

I include Mr. Beck's eulogy in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES M. BECK

My fellow members, we are met on the eve of a great anniversary. Tomorrow will be the one hundred and eighty-fifth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson. It would be strange, indeed, if the Sons of the Revolution failed to note the natal day of the author of the Declaration of Independence. Such a commemoration is a debt not only to the dead but to the unborn.

Thomas Jefferson was the most successful politician that the American Commonwealth has yet given to the world. I used the word "politician" in its original and nobler sense, for, as the late Thomas B. Reed once aptly said, "A statesman is only a dead politician." For a quarter of a century he dominated the politics of this country as no other man has before or since. His extraordinary career is the more remarkable, for apparently his equipment for leadership was slight. His personality had none of the leonine majesty of the greatest of Virginians, who impressed men as the aged Lear did the intrepid Kent, in having that which men obeyed, "authority." His was not the handsome presence and magnetic personality of his great rival, Alexander Hamilton, that "Admirable Crichton" of our history. Nor did he have the analytical mind of John Marshall. He was not an orator like Henry or Adams. A shy, diffident man, he hated the "morbid rage of debate", rarely spoke in public, and when he did his voice quickly became husky and inarticulate. He was by temperament and choice a philosopher and philanthropist and was most happy when "far from the madding crowd." He loved his garden more than the councils of the mighty, and yet, paradoxical as it may seem, he was the most aggressive and militant leader of a political party that our history has known.

A successful political career was furthermore the more improbable in his case, as Jefferson was born idealist. This can be seen if we contrast what the Declaration of Independence would have been if Franklin, Hamilton, or Marshall, instead of Jefferson, had been its draftsman. Franklin would have restricted it to a utilitarian discussion of the advantage to foreign nations of assisting in the creation of a new government and weakening the power of the British Empire. He would also have enlivened his discussion of practical politics with a touch of humor which would have increased the gaiety of nations. Hamilton or Marshall would have restricted the declaration to an analytical statement of the constitutional principle involved in taxing the Colonies without the consent of the legal legislators.

Jefferson, however, sounds in the very opening sentence a keynote of such lofty moral purpose that the literature of state documents of that time can be searched without a fitting parallel. In an age when might made right and international morality barely existed, he broadly asserted that a nation which resorts to force must justify itself upon moral grounds at the bar of the nations, for "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation."

Mark the word "requires." This assumes that there is a law of right and wrong, which, standing higher than laws, precedents and conventions, regulates the relations of nations as well as individuals. It avows its belief in a great human conscience which, rising above the interests of nations and races, would approve the right and condemn the wrong.

The concluding portion of the declaration further recognizes that even above the conscience of mankind was the Ruler of Nations, by its solemn appeal "to the Supreme Judge of the World for the rectitude of our intentions." The enthusiasm of the idealist is further indicated in the sweeping statement that it is a self-evident truth that "all men are born equal", although no truth is less self-evident and, except in a restricted and purely political sense, it was not a reality then and is not now. In this respect Jefferson was again a great human paradox, for this inspired idealist was one of the most practical statesmen of his or any time.

Idealists are generally supposed to be out of place in practical politics. Shakespeare's wonderful character study of Brutus illustrates this by suggesting that if Cassius, the practical politician, had headed the progressive movement in ancient Rome, instead of the noble idealist, Brutus, there might have been a different result. The contrast between the two characters is finely pointed in the quarrel scene, when Brutus speaks of the assassination of the foremost man of all that time as in the nature of a holy sacrifice, while Cassius says—like every practical politician in a crisis—

"At such a time as this it is not meet
That every nice offense should bear his comment."

Did Shakespeare intend to satirize the occasional unconscious inconsistency of some sincere idealists in this same scene when he makes Brutus quarrel with Cassius for the latter's failure to give Brutus money to pay his legions, while criticizing the methods by which Cassius obtained the tainted money?

Jefferson's ruling passion and dominant characteristic was that of the student. No one of his time, with the exception of Franklin, ever gave so much of a life to intellectual pursuits. From early boyhood until his latest hours he remained the unwearied and zealous student of the great subjects which challenge the attention of the human intellect. A valued correspondent of four great colleges, the successor of Franklin as president of the American Philosophical Society, he crowned his most useful life by

founding the University of Virginia, upon lines so broad and catholic as to anticipate many of the most valued improvements in education. Art, music, literature, history, politics, science, agriculture, philosophy, religion, all engaged his thoughts, and of these, the great library, which in the days of his poverty he was compelled to sell to the Government, is a demonstration. In those days men did not buy books as decorative furniture, but each book was bought to read and study.

It required 16 wagons to transport his 10,000 books to Washington, and it was found that they were written in many languages and comprised in their sweep nearly every department of intellectual activity. When he planned the great university, his idea of the curriculum was botany, chemistry, zoology, anatomy, surgery, medicine, natural philosophy, agriculture, mathematics, astronomy, biography, politics, commerce, history, ethics, the law, the industrial and the fine arts, and in all of these his versatile mind took an intelligent interest. Few men in recorded history have been more versatile. In this respect he is only surpassed in his century by Franklin, and he belongs to the class of universal genius of which Franklin and Leonardo da Vinci were the greatest illustrations. Here was a man who could supervise a farm, study nature like a scientist, make useful inventions, draw the plans for a mansion or a public building with the detail of a practical architect, play a Mozart minuet on the violin, ride after the hounds, write a brief, or manage an intricate law case, draft State papers of exceptional importance, and conduct correspondence with distinguished men in half a dozen languages upon questions of history, law, ethics, politics, science, literature, and the fine arts. To him the ancient classics were "a sublime luxury", and he thanked God that He had given him in his early education this great source of delight. One of his recreations was the reading of Homer in its melodious original. His linguistic studies included Latin, Greek, French, Spanish, Italian, and Gaelic. With his all-absorbing love of study, his unflagging intellectual activity, and his natural preference for a scholar's seclusion, he would have been in more peaceful times a philosopher or scientist or a president of a college or university.

The general tendency is to associate the subjective literary faculty with a certain atrophy of the will and a clouding of the judgment. Excessive mental activity does tend to destroy the equilibrium which should prevail between the subjective and the objective faculties of the mind. In this respect Jefferson's extraordinary career seems to contradict the common experience of life and leads us to repeat our inquiry, What was the secret of his unequalled success? How did he, the intellectual recluse, become, in the apt language of one of his contemporaries, "the most delightful destroyer of dust and cobwebs that his time has ever known?"

I find that secret primarily in his sturdy optimism—in the fact that he believed in the work which he attempted to do, in his own ability to do it, in its significance in the predestined advancement of humanity, and in the ability and disposition of his fellow men to follow a true leader. Even these qualities would have availed but little had not his work of establishing democracy synchronized with the spirit of the times. He was the most successful leader of the masses, because he understood their higher inspirations and best voiced their then inarticulate voice.

Democracy is still a prophecy, and of its many prophets few surpass Jefferson in real achievement. This is far from saying that he brought about the democratic era with which the nineteenth century began. To that mighty development many illustrious men and uncounted millions of unknown men had contributed in the long centuries before the emancipation of the masses. The first American Democrat was Franklin, but, in that darkest hour before the dawn, Jefferson played the role of Chantecler—his clarion call to wider freedom, while not causing the reddening skies, yet proclaimed the morn. In this is his transcendent merit.

From his earliest manhood Jefferson best voiced the spirit of his time by proclaiming eternal warfare against every tyranny over the mind of man. Only 9 days before his death he again showed his unconquerable faith in the triumph of the cause, to which he had dedicated his life, when he wrote for the fiftieth anniversary of the great Declaration, upon which he was destined to die:

"All eyes are opened or opening to the rights of man. Then general spread of the light of science has already laid open to every view the palpable truth that the masses of mankind have not been born with saddles on their backs nor a favored few booted and spurred ready to ride them legitimately by the grace of God."

Jefferson truly had the "oversoul", of which Emerson wrote, "the personality that neither flatters nor falls, and which never appeals from itself but believes in itself." It consisted in that faith which can "remove mountains" and "overcome the world", for he powerfully aided in removing mountains of old customs and habits of thought and overcame a world, in which the common man had had but too little opportunity. The world has no use for the half-hearted men. Its prizes are for those who throw their whole soul into their work, and with the devouring fire of determination and energy consume the obstacles which lie in their path. Such was the spirit of Thomas Jefferson. He met responsibility halfway. He rejoiced as a strong man to run his course.

To succeed in life, moreover, we must not only have faith in ourselves and in our work but in our fellow men. Democracy has proved a great leveler, and if a man has a public work to do he had better not commence with the premise that he is of a superior caste. Jefferson believed passionately in the people.

While he did not regard them as infallible and never assumed that the oil of anointing had fallen from the head of the monarch and conferred infallibility upon the multitudinous tongue of the people, yet, with a passionate fervor which was with him as a religion, he believed that the common sense of the majority could be better trusted than the interested views of a property-holding class. Speaking to his neighbors of Albemarle on returning from France in 1790, he said:

"The will of the majority, the natural law of every society, is the only sure guardian of the rights of man. Perhaps even this may sometimes err, but its errors are honest, solitary, and short lived."

In his first inaugural he said:

"If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the sanity with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it."

I have already quoted the optimistic prediction which he made 9 days before his death, to be read on the fiftieth anniversary of the great Declaration, when, with trembling hand but with a buoyant and eternally youthful heart, he wrote: "All eyes are opened or opening to the rights of man."

Viewed in the colder light of a later age, his countless critics have charged him with having been excessively suspicious of his opponents' motives, but it must never be forgotten that, throughout the whole of his long public career, his political opponents continuously impugned Jefferson's motives and denounced him as a demagogue, a Jacobin, an atheist, and an anarchist. For many years he accepted with heroic composure a greater storm of abuse than was possibly ever visited upon any public man in our history, and if, in his later years, his pent-up spirit found bitter and at times unjust expression in his later writings, something must be allowed to a proud spirit who had for so many years accepted insult without reply. If the furious tempest of his times occasionally drove him from his true course, let it be remembered that only one of his contemporaries—the great-souled Washington—always remained true to the North Star.

The greatest inconsistency charged against Jefferson was his acquisition of "Louisiana"—meaning thereby the whole trans-Mississippi region—in supposed violation of his own construction of the Constitution, but this may be due to a misconception of his position and it is possible that if his critics, comprising in this respect most historians, had been as good constitutional lawyers as was Jefferson, they would recognize that Jefferson, in this greatest achievement of his whole career, was more consistent than his critics have supposed.

The problem of acquiring new territory was a new one, and in solving the problem of Louisiana, Jefferson was treading an unbeaten path. He appreciated the enormous importance of the opportunity. He wrote to Monroe:

"On the event of this mission depends the future destinies of this Republic."

And again he wrote to Livingston:

"We are satisfied nothing else will secure us against a war at no distant period."

His opponents opposed the acquisition as in violation of the Constitution, and certain passages in Jefferson's letters apparently indicate that he believed that it would be better for the country to avail itself of an unrivaled opportunity to complete our continental domain even if its constitutionality was doubtful, especially as he felt complete confidence in a subsequent ratification of the acquisition by the American people.

It is, however, inaccurate to say—as nearly all historians have said—that Jefferson had reached the definite conclusion that it was unconstitutional to acquire Louisiana without a constitutional amendment. In his letter to Gallatin, written in January 1803, he thus aptly states his real conviction:

"You are right in my opinion as to Mr. Lincoln's proposition. There is no constitutional difficulty as to the acquisition of territory and whether, when acquired, it may be taken into the Union by the Constitution as it now stands will become a question of expediency. I think it will be safer not to permit the enlargement of the Union but by amendment of the Constitution."

In other words, Jefferson believed that it was constitutional to acquire Louisiana as territory, but that it was of doubtful constitutionality to incorporate it into the Federal compact without an amendment, and this distinction between "acquisition" and "incorporation" was the very distinction which the Supreme Court subsequently recognized in the insular cases.

Jefferson was more sagacious than his critics; and today this constitutional distinction is familiar to us under which we hold the Philippines and Puerto Rico as colonial dependencies without admitting them into the Federal Union considered as a constitutional compact.

Without suggesting that Mr. Jefferson was never guilty of inconsistencies—for a successful political career is only too apt to involve at times a compromise of conviction—yet the judicious historian will recognize that Jefferson was as consistently loyal to his lofty political ideals as any public man of our history, with the single exception of Washington.

Freely recognizing his failings and errors, they were far outweighed by his transcendent merits. His idealistic abstractions have turned the world upside down. If it be true, and I think it is, that they have done a great deal of harm, yet it is also true that they have done even greater good. They gave the common man hope and inspiration. The level of the human race was appreciably raised by Jefferson.

As one of his most engaging biographers, Parton has well said: "He defended the honor of the human intellect when its natural foes throughout Christendom conspired to revile, degrade, and crush it. He enjoyed his existence and made it a benefaction to his kind."

RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention today to spend much time in discussing the pros and cons of the reciprocal-trade agreements. Both sides of the question have been hashed and rehashed pretty thoroughly during the past few months. And before that, so long as the United States has been engaged in foreign trade, the arguments for and against the protective tariff have gone on uninteruptedly.

As usual, when the argument waxes hot, we find ourselves arguing extremes rather than a legitimate middle ground. In contradiction to some of the more heated opponents of the new tariff amendments let me state, then, that the reciprocal-trade agreements do not, nor ever will, constitute free trade.

There may have been a time when it would have been possible or feasible for the United States to wall herself around with a forbidding protective tariff and to exist for and within herself. But American industry and American production have expanded too fast in the past 20 years to make such a course anything but economic suicide today.

I have noticed a tendency on the part of opponents of the new trade agreements to decry as too impractical and intangible for argument the mooted benefits in international amity and good will. Progress, as represented by the airplane, fast steamship service, and high-speed trains, has made international good will an economic necessity. We are not, as some of our shouting patriots would have us believe, a miniature Mars looking down in glorious independence on the pitiful struggles of interesting but remote neighbors.

In the amendment to the tariff act passed in 1934 it was stated that the amendments were asked for the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States. Certainly none of us are so nationalistic as to deny the need for foreign outlets for American goods, nor so selfish or idealistic—depending on the viewpoint—as to believe that foreign markets will be thrown open to us without the granting of certain concessions for return trade.

In adjusting these concessions it has been the purpose of the Government to prevent, insofar as possible, the dumping on the American market of the products of cheap foreign labor. Since foreign wage scales generally are far below our own, no tariff will be completely successful on that score unless it closes our markets to all foreign goods—an impossible condition.

I might point out at this time that those who are crying loudest over this threat to American wage scales and the American standard of living are the very same people who called N. R. A. efforts to fix a minimum living wage communism and interference with the rights of industry. They seem to have some difficulty in making up their minds on the subject of the Government's obligations to protect its citizens. It would seem to boil down to the premise that Government interference is legitimate when it protects capital but is revolution when it protects labor.

Generally speaking, then, the objectives of the reciprocal-trade agreements are all in favor of American industry. The question is whether or not they have obtained their objectives.

It is my contention that there are as yet no accurate facts and figures on which to judge.

I should like, however, to point out a few of the more obvious fallacies in the arguments of those who are trying to prove that the agreements have failed of their purpose, and to take up some of the points which they have so carefully overlooked.

Those who hope to produce national panic by shouting from the housetops a jumble of incomplete and hastily computed figures to prove that that balance of trade has been upset are guilty of the same tactics as the labor agitator who builds one case of abuse into an emotional crisis that sweeps the good and bad before it in a torrent of mob hysteria.

Even if the figures were complete, the quotation of statistics in whole or in part does not present a complete picture. There are too many inconstant factors in the world economic situation to make any one year a standard of comparison for the next.

One does not hear our stout defenders of American industry calling attention to the fact that on the strength of the 1930 Tariff Act, which was highly protective, American exports to foreign countries were reduced by 30 percent in 1931 and by another 30 percent in 1932. We suspect that that is another disturbing fact that is to remain discreetly buried under the all-embracing blanket argument of the depression.

Do not think that I am underestimating the effect of the depression on those figures. I mention them as a proof of my point, that unless all the contributing factors are considered statistics may lie more damagingly than deliberate distortion of the truth.

As an example, I should like to question one of the arguments advanced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] in his speech on March 4 decrying the disastrous results of the reciprocal-trade agreements.

With grave alarm he pointed out that during 1935 American imports of merchandise increased by 24 percent, whereas exports increased by only 7 percent. He blames this discrepancy on reciprocal trade.

At the same time, it is interesting to note, he failed to bring to light the fact that American exports to Canada increased by only 7 percent over 1934 while imports increased by 25 percent. The figures are almost identical, yet there was at that time no reciprocal treaty with Canada in operation.

Had Mr. TREADWAY wished to present a more complete picture he might have mentioned the fact that during the same year there was a drop of 25 percent in exports to Germany and that that drop was accompanied by a rise of approximately 9 percent in imports from the same country. Since Germany has not benefited by the agreements, she can scarcely be condemned on the strength of that discrepancy.

It has been further pointed out that the Cuban treaty resulted in a tremendous increase in imports with which the exports did not keep step. Under the same treaty imports to the United States from Cuba decreased by \$7,000,000 during the month of November 1935 from the November 1934 level, and exports to Cuba increased by a million and a quarter in the same month. If statistics do not lie, I challenge Mr. TREADWAY to fit that into his picture.

It is not to be expected or hoped that reciprocal-trade agreements will react favorably on all industries. But American business is made up of interdependent units and what benefits one will, in the long run, benefit all. Naturally the grasping individualists find it difficult to subordinate their major interests to the common good, but it is time that we began to realize that protection for the few is an expensive proposition for a country of this size.

In my own district the Canadian treaty is the primary concern. Those of us who live near the border have reason to be grateful for the long years of peace and friendship which have marked the relations between the United States and Canada. We owe much of our past prosperity to the absolute security that is ours in our dealings with our neighbors across the line. Anything that tends to perpetuate that security will of necessity increase and safeguard prosperity.

A considerable percentage of the constituency of western New York is made up of fruit and dairy farmers over whose woes so many editorial tears have been shed.

For the benefit of the former I should like to point out that during January of 1936 the export of fruit to Canada

increased 50 percent over the same period for 1935. The fruit farmers seem to be in no immediate danger.

The threat to the dairy farmers is almost equally nebulous. A survey of the fluctuations in prices of dairy products during the past 15 years shows that these prices react far more quickly to the condition of business in the country generally than to any alterations in trade schedules or duty rates. The dairy farmers will be among the first to react to the general improvement in conditions that will follow on an expansion of industrial markets.

And already the industrial market is expanding. During January 1936 Canadian purchases of machinery from the United States increased 70 percent over similar purchases in January 1935.

In conclusion I should like to quote briefly from an editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, a Republican newspaper, relative to the reciprocal-trade agreement with Canada:

If one argues that an increased foreign trade is an aid to recovery, one must commend the treaty negotiated by Secretary Cordell Hull. The volume of trade between the two countries is still small as compared with that which enriched both nations in the years immediately following 1920. A good start, however, has been made in the direction of closer trade relations which will benefit both parties. Although specific elements may find their interests temporarily harmed, the betterment of both populations in general should reconcile them to their condition. If the masses of Canadians and Americans can sell more goods to each other, they inevitably will buy more from their own industrial and agricultural producers.

THE COST OF WAR AND ITS PREVENTION

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an address of my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered over the radio by Hon. WILLIAM P. CONNERY, Jr., on April 9, 1936:

Friends of the radio audience, last Monday we celebrated here in Washington and elsewhere in the United States what we now know as Army Day.

This is the day annually dedicated to those who are serving in the Army of the United States and those who are attached to the Reserve forces.

While we all pray for peace to all, and while we hope and trust that those who are serving in the armed forces of our Nation will not be called upon to engage in battle it is worth while being prepared, and well prepared, to defend our shores.

As I, in company with other Members of the Congress, reviewed the Army parade from the steps of the National Capitol my mind subconsciously recalled the day, some 19 years ago, when I, as a member of the One Hundred and First Infantry of the Twenty-sixth Yankee Division, the National Guard of Massachusetts, proudly paraded the streets of Framingham on my way to the trenches in France.

We Americans—yes, the pride of America—marched proudly to the boats waiting to take us to a foreign shore to engage in battles from which many thousands never returned.

As a result of an insidious campaign of propaganda we had been successfully enticed or cajoled into a war on a foreign soil. We went not as an aggressor seeking the acquisition of or to acquire new territory. We went not because we sought or envied the wealth of the people of any other nation. We were led into or induced to participate in the World War because our country had been led to believe that, through our participating, we would make the world safe for democracy.

I need not emphasize that while those Americans who served in the trenches of France, those who manned our ships which made possible the safe landing of our boys in France, or those who gave up their lives during the World War, may have protected the wealth of the international bankers of France, of England, and some in our own country, that in so doing I regret to say we unknowingly saddled upon the people of America a debt that even our children's children will still be paying long after the last of those who participated in the World War have passed on.

When we entered into the World War our national debt was less than \$3,000,000,000, or a per-capita debt of less than \$30 for each resident of our country.

When the armistice was signed we had accumulated a total national debt of more than \$25,000,000,000, or a per-capita debt of something like \$250 for every man, woman, and child living within our country.

This monetary loss can be made up, but how can we ever make up for the loss of the lives of the 126,000 American boys who were killed or who died as a result of injuries, or how can we ever repay those 240,000 other Americans who at the time of the armistice were listed as having been injured as a result of the war, many thousands of whom have since passed on, due wholly to the injuries they had received.

The total cost of our entry into the World War is as yet unknown. Even though the armistice was signed some 18 years ago, we are still paying for losses incurred, and it is my opinion we will be paying for years yet to come.

Conservatively it is estimated by Treasury officials that our entry into the World War will have cost in money alone a total of some \$50,000,000,000, or the equivalent of some \$400 for every one of the 125,000,000 of our people.

On behalf of the thousands of my comrades who willingly sacrificed their lives, and the thousands of those still in hospitals, suffering in mind and body, tortured as a result of injuries received in battle or sickness acquired on the battlefields of Europe, I want to assure my listeners that the one thought of every American who served his country and carried the Stars and Stripes into the World War is to insure the American people against participating in another war.

Some may assume that it is easy to eliminate war. Some will tell you that if the profit is taken out of war we will have no war.

Perhaps they are right. But let me ask any person after careful consideration to point to any nation which has engaged in a major war, or the people of any such countries, other than possibly a few, where the nations, or the people of such nations, were financially or morally better off when the war had been concluded and the peace pact signed.

Statistics show that every country engaging in a major war, such as the recent World War, suffers a loss that is irreparable, both in loss of property value as well as in loss of the lives of their people.

Will anyone contend that even the international bankers actually profit when their own country engages in a major war? Even though their investments or worldly possessions may have been enlarged, the loss of their loved ones, their sons and daughters, their nephews and nieces, those they loved who were taken from them on the battlefield or in the hospitals, is a loss that no amount of gold will ever offset.

While the profits the international bankers may secure out of a major war may be such that their worldly possessions are temporarily increased, in reality their wealth is decreased in that their share of the Nation's increased debt imposed upon their children will in most cases offset such temporary gain.

War is never profitable, yet statistics show that we, the people of liberty-loving, peace-loving America have engaged in wars on foreign soil four times since we gained our freedom in 1776.

Our people were forced to make the sacrifices every war demands and exacts simply because other nations, or those governing other nations, believed that they were better prepared for battle than we were.

Nations are very rarely different, collectively, than the average individuals who comprise or make up such nations. Those individuals who are physically fit, those boys who make a practice of daily spending a half hour or so in the gymnasium, are rarely attacked, even by the local bullies. Why? Simply because the local bully and the others know that such boys are physically fit and well able not only to defend themselves but, in addition, most likely will damage the appearance of the aggressors before the battle is over.

Such boys as those who are physically fit are seldom found to be the aggressors. They are not called upon to fight because they are prepared to fight and to win.

The people of America do not envy the land, the riches, or the possessions of any other people. We have lived in almost perfect harmony with our neighbors to the north and to the south of us with only an imaginary boundary line between us.

The people of America are better insured against war than the people of any other nation I know of. Our forefathers apparently foresaw dangers far ahead of their times.

The people of America are insured against war on foreign soil in that no officer of our Government can declare war except by action of the Congress of the United States. Let me repeat this unusually happy position in which our people find themselves insofar as our being dragged into a war on foreign soil.

No official of our Government can order or direct our Army or our Navy to participate in any war without a vote of the Congress of the United States. Congress, being the duly elected representatives of all of our people, will hesitate well in the future before authorizing such a declaration, to my mind, except to protect our land and our people against an invading army or navy.

Our greatest danger is that through some entangling alliances—so-called peace pacts—or through our entry into the League of Nations we will be engulfed into a sea of turmoil among or with other foreign nations and from which there is but one honorable escape, and that, I regret to say, is war. Against such a possibility we can protect our people only through Congress refusing to engage in any entangling alliances with other nations.

We can further insure ourselves against being dragged into or cajoled into war by eliminating the present profits of war.

Implementations of war should be manufactured by the Government in its own arsenals and in its own shipyards.

It may, and it can, be contended that those of inventive genius, who, through years of sacrifice and study, develop implements or accessories of value to our national defense, should have a market in our own country for the work of their brain or their hands. They should have.

We can easily authorize the establishment or the creation of a governmental agency, which agency would be empowered to purchase the exclusive right to use such implements as were found of value. The creators of such implements should be, and would be, adequately rewarded.

Further, I believe that our people should acquire and impound—now, if necessary—ample stores of those metals and supplies for which at the present time we must look to other nations in case of need.

In other words, we should, insofar as is possible, eliminate any possible profit to those who would cause or would seek to drag us into a war with any foreign nation, except to defend our country in case of invasion.

When we eliminate the profit that some assume there is in our country engaging in a war with a foreign nation we will have made a real step toward eliminating the possibility of our country again being dragged into or cajoled into any war. General Sherman well said, "War is hell."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I object to the editorial.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. I hope the gentleman will not object. It is an editorial on the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the policy has been adopted of keeping editorials out of the RECORD; consequently, I must object to the editorial.

AFTER 19 YEARS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert a speech delivered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN] over the radio on April 2.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Hon. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN, Member of Congress from the First District of Connecticut, over Station WOL, Washington, April 2, 1936:

We're at it again.

Nineteen years ago today Woodrow Wilson called the Congress of the United States into extraordinary session. The Nation trembled with fear and with excitement. The hot breath of war was sweeping across the United States. President Wilson outlined the events that had led to the special session of Congress and called upon his people to wage war.

Quickly the Congress hastened to carry out what seemed to be the wishes of the people. The war resolution was drafted, presented to the Senate. Senator after Senator made fervent, patriotic speeches.

On April 4, 1917, the Senate voted for war. All next day the House of Representatives debated the resolution. Speech after speech swept across the floor, united in a clamor for conflict. In the early hours of April 6 the resolution came to a vote. The outcome was as swift and as sure as it had been in the Senate. America was in the World War.

Our munitions makers couldn't restrain their jubilation; our military and naval enthusiasts whooped with joy; young men, boys in colleges, sons, husbands, brothers, threw back their shoulders and strutted about in eager anticipation of the days soon to come when they would be wearing uniforms. Mothers, wives, sisters, sweethearts, fired with patriotic fervor, proudly urged their men to join up. Others sobbed with fear because the persons they loved most were going to battle, perhaps never to return.

Only a small cry was raised for peace. Six Senators and fifty Congressmen spoke for peace in those war-filled days. Fifty-five men and one woman faced political suicide to argue against the course for which their President had pleaded. Vilified, scorned, burned in effigy by their constituents, branded as traitors, they found no praise for what they had done. They had expected none.

A few private citizens also asked why we had to go to war, why we had to participate in that carnage. For what did we have to sacrifice our youth? But their cries were quickly drowned. Pacifists were taboo in those days. And so the war to end wars was fought.

Men full of life and ambition left home never to return. Others left and returned without their minds, without their sight, without their health, without arms, legs, lungs. But the war to end wars had been fought.

Peace treaties were signed, disarmament promises were made. For a few years it seemed that the war had been well fought, that its purposes had been accomplished.

And then came the dawn. Depression overtook the world. Foreign nations consistently began defaulting on their war debts. But they found funds to rebuild their armies and navies and air

forces. They seemed to find plausible excuses for rearming. Peace treaties, disarmament agreements stood in their way, so they broke their promises and renounced their treaties.

The mad race for war preparation went on over there.

And the germ found its way into these United States. Beginning with 1924 the sum of money set aside for the Army and Navy began to climb appallingly until today we have just passed the largest peacetime appropriation bill for the War Department and are facing the largest peacetime appropriation bill for the Navy Department.

Wise Benjamin Franklin said that "wars are not paid for in wartime; the bill comes later." How well we know that.

More than 60 cents of every tax dollar paid by you, the citizens of this country, into the Federal Treasury goes for the payment of past and future wars. We are developing a formidable air force. We have appropriated funds for supporting compulsory military training in our colleges, for increasing the student force at Annapolis and West Point, for a larger Navy, stronger arsenals within the boundaries of this Nation, more bombers, a larger standing Army, more officers.

But these are only the first expenditures. What of the pensions, disability compensations, bonuses; the cost of maintaining the Veterans' Administration, the veterans' hospitals and homes? Whatever meager benefits the veterans gain from such expenditures are their rightful due. You drove them into war. They were incapacitated in your service. Pensions for their widows and families are only just. Pensions for veterans of the Spanish and Civil Wars—why not?

The veterans of the World War demanded and obtained a bonus. Supposed to be paid in 1945, they presented such arguments that Congress voted it to them immediately, 9 years before it was due. Why not? Today they live; tomorrow they die.

These pensions and bonuses are just a part of war expenditures. If we are going to fight we must be willing to stand all the cost of such fighting. But, why fight?

Today we are definitely preparing for war. No other reason can be ascribed to the activity in our Army and Navy Departments. But arms, ammunitions, poisonous gases, battleships, and air bombers mean nothing unless we have the men to command them. The day is probably not far off when we are going to send a call to all the able-bodied young men, whether they wish it or not, to enter the ranks.

These young men expect such a call. But they are taking a lesson from the experience of veterans of past wars. They want some assurance that fighting will be made worth their while. War will jeopardize their future. They have seen it happen with older brothers, fathers, uncles, friends.

Today, while we are still at peace, they want to have all they can get out of life. They know of the fight veterans had to wage before Congress granted their pensions and bonuses.

They have banded themselves into a new veterans' organization, known as the Veterans of Future Wars. They realize the power of organization. Started a few weeks ago, it has spread into every section of the country. These young men are facing the inevitable. For some reason, difficult to understand, we are preparing for war. There is nothing they can do about it. They are patriotic. If the call comes, they are prepared to meet it. But they aren't going to have any haggling about a paltry few billions for their bonuses and pensions after the months of service are over. No sir, they are demanding payment in advance, right now.

They have issued a manifesto claiming, and I quote, "Whereas it is inevitable that this country will be engaged in war, and whereas it is by all accounts likely that every man of military age will have a part in this war", they demand that the Government pay a bonus of \$1,000 to every male citizen between the ages of 18 and 36, due June 1, 1965, payable immediately. They claim and I quote, "It is but common right that this bonus be paid now, for many will be killed in the next war, and hence they, the most deserving, will not otherwise get the full benefit of their country's gratitude."

They have provided for the women of America, too, and demand pensions of \$50 a month for future wives, and free pilgrimages to Europe for future mothers to view the future battlefields. The demand of other organized blocs on our Treasury are peanuts compared to this one.

Daily new posts of the Veterans of Future Wars are forming. I learned yesterday that a post has been formed in Trinity College, located in my home town of Hartford, Conn.

They demand that we go the whole way, and pay for manpower in advance, just as we are paying in advance for materials in preparation of war. If you think their argument is ridiculous, you should listen to the talk I am compelled to hear every time a bill is before the Congress urging appropriations for larger armies, greater navies, more bombers, etc.

On the other hand, when the engineers of the Army work out plans for flood control that mean the saving of lives and homes and property, a most laudable work, then you should listen to the weighty arguments of those who would protect the Treasury in the interests of the taxpayer, and watch the appropriation bills for rivers and harbors slashed right and left.

They cry of extravagance because we clothe and feed the unemployed, because we save homes, farms, and businesses. But no word of criticism except from a few weak voices is heard in protest to vast expenditures to fight an enemy no one knows.

If the people were organized into a bloc, demanding their right of peace, as other blocs have demanded their rights, your Congress

would think twice before it approved these billions for war programs too extensive for our own needs.

What has America to fear? The nations of the world need our friendship as much as we need theirs. Except for a brief outburst, quickly ended, we have had no trouble in North America. In South America we want nothing. They want nothing from us. Are we preparing to enter a European war? And if so, why?

They talk of an enemy which will come to our western shores from Asia and invade our country. The nearest nation to our western shores is more than 5,000 miles away.

We're talking peace and acting war. We're crying for economy, and spending huge sums of money increasing our Army and Navy uselessly. We glory about American traditions, and the first tradition of civilization, peace, is being flaunted with a derision which is barbaric.

And all the time unrest and discontent are seeping into the veins of this land of ours, making madmen and rebels of our people, who want nothing more than a chance to work peacefully and live peacefully with their neighbors.

Truly we are emphasizing the wrong American traditions. We're at it again, preparing for war. Why not prepare for peace?

INFORMATION CONCERNING FEDERAL RIGHTS OF VETERANS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and include therein three letters, one from Mr. Thomas Kirby, national legislative chairman of the Disabled American Veterans; one from Mr. John Thomas Taylor, director national legislative committee of the American Legion; and one from Mr. Millard W. Rice, legislative representative of the Veterans' of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS OF THE WORLD WAR,
Washington, April 9, 1936.

The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PATMAN: We are deeply appreciative of your letter of thanks for the assistance we were glad in giving in the preparation of the booklet on Information Concerning Federal Rights of Veterans.

So necessarily involved is the vast problem of the care of former service men that it is extremely difficult for anyone to keep informed on all these matters. However, the 62-page booklet just issued as a reprint of your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is so comprehensive and accurate that it should be invaluable to veterans and those advising veterans.

We have been pleased to distribute this pamphlet to our rehabilitation officers everywhere, as well as to other D. A. V. officials who are helping the wartime disabled in the establishment of their claims.

Cordially yours,

THOMAS KIRBY,
National Legislative Chairman.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., April 9, 1936.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: Your recent letter expressing appreciation for our contribution of material and suggestions for your excellent compilation of the rights, privileges, and benefits available to veterans and their dependents under various Federal and State laws was indeed gratifying.

So highly valuable do we consider this resumé that we immediately ordered 5,000 copies in pamphlet form for distribution to our 3,500 local posts and service officers. This pamphlet fills a long-felt need and will prove of inestimable value to thousands of veterans and their dependents.

The V. F. W. is deeply grateful to you for your splendid service to veterans.

Very respectfully yours,

MILLARD W. RICE,
Legal Representative.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., April 10, 1936.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR WRIGHT: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 9, expressing to us your appreciation for the cooperation in the preparation of the pamphlet containing information dealing with veterans' benefits.

I assure you that it has been a real pleasure for us to join with you in this matter, and I take this opportunity to congratulate you upon the splendid results of your efforts. This pamphlet contains just the information that the veterans throughout the country

are anxious to have. It will be of great help also to the service officers in the thousands of posts of the American Legion. They, too, will appreciate it, and I am ordering a quantity to send out to them.

Again I thank you for the splendid job you have done and assure you that this pamphlet is just what veterans' organizations have required in simple and condensed form for a long time.

Sincerely,

JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Director, National Legislative Committee.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE LATE JAMES M. BECK

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret I announce the death of the Honorable James M. Beck, formerly a Member of Congress from the State of Pennsylvania, and an outstanding authority on the Constitution. He was honored by legal societies throughout the world and was an Honorary Bencher of Grays Inn, England. Writer, orator, lawyer, Solicitor General of the United States, in spite of his great record he was a modest and retiring man.

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable James M. Beck will be mourned by his many friends.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by publishing in the RECORD a historical account of the life of James M. Beck, as recorded in one of today's Philadelphia morning papers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

JAMES M. BECK IS DEAD AT 75; NOTED LAWYER—LEADING CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY WAS HARDING'S SOLICITOR GENERAL; SERVED IN CONGRESS—BORN IN PHILADELPHIA; HAD LAW CAREER; FOUGHT FOR REPEAL; STRICKEN BY HEART ATTACK AT HOME IN CAPITAL

By Paul J. McGahan

WASHINGTON, April 12.—James M. Beck, one of the Nation's outstanding authorities on constitutional law and a sharp-spoken critic of the New Deal, died at his home here today.

The former United States Solicitor General and Member of Congress from Philadelphia was 75 years old.

He died of a heart attack, which came on suddenly as he moved, apparently well, about the house he had long occupied at 1624 Twenty-first Street NW. Stricken at 3:30 p. m., he died an hour later.

At his side were his wife, Mrs. Lilla Mitchell Beck, and his daughter, Mrs. Beatrice Beck Tuck, with whom he had not long before had Easter dinner. His son, James M. Beck, Jr., who lives in London, was informed immediately of his father's death.

MANY EXPRESS REGRET

The news came as a shock to his many friends and colleagues in Washington officialdom, and evoked expression of regret even in quarters where he had been considered a foe.

It was while he served as Republican Solicitor General, appointed by President Harding in 1921, that he gained his national reputation as an expert on the Constitution of the United States.

His active political career ended when he retired voluntarily from the House of Representatives as a Member from Philadelphia, on January 3, 1935.

DOCTOR'S REPORT

Dr. Walter A. Bloedorn, the attending physician, issued the following statement this afternoon:

"Mr. Beck died suddenly today at 4:30 o'clock of coronary thrombosis at his residence. He had appeared well at luncheon and was dressed and walking about at 3:30 when the attack came and he died within a short time."

To say that James M. Beck was a mere student of the Constitution of the United States would not only be injustice but grievous understatement.

He worshiped it as a living and evolving organism, defended it as the greatest single manuscript of government the mind of man had ever produced, and years before his death had earned the distinction of being one of the foremost constitutional lawyers in the United States.

Mr. Beck not only knew every syllable of the Constitution, but he knew the spirit and the minds of the men who created it. He knew the background of bitter history out of which it had sprung, the old English common law which had entered into its making, the racial characteristics of the members of the constitutional assembly which finally presented it to the people.

It was this complete knowledge of and enthusiastic sympathy with the times and the men which saw its promulgation that made any reference to it from his mouth or pen a vital utterance; and this zeal and fervor which carried him to such notable victories during his term as Solicitor General of the United States under Presidents Warren G. Harding and Calvin Coolidge.

His uncontested knowledge of the constitutional law of the country gave him an attentive audience whenever, in the latter years of his life, he rose to address the lower house of Congress, and made him a powerful advocate for prohibition reform, which he argued solely on its constitutional merits.

NATIVE SON OF PHILADELPHIA

James Montgomery Beck was born in Philadelphia on July 9, 1861, the son of James Nathan Beck and Margaretta C. Darling Beck. He received his early education in the public schools of the city, and was graduated from Moravian College in 1880. Four years later he was admitted to the Philadelphia bar, his law partner being the late William F. Harry, and 2 years thereafter married Miss Lilla Mitchell, daughter of James Mitchell, of Philadelphia.

His public life began 2 years prior to his marriage, in 1888, when he was named as Assistant United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, a capacity in which he served until 1892. Four years later he was appointed United States Attorney in Philadelphia, leaving that office in 1900 to become Assistant United States Attorney General in Washington.

Endowed with a brilliant mind, a memory which for years was to be a marvel to all who heard him, a genuine enthusiasm for the law, and a scholarship which won him innumerable honors, his progress in his profession was not only immediate but continuing.

ADMITTED TO NEW YORK BAR

Mr. Beck served as assistant to the Attorney General in Washington for 3 years, through the tenure of President McKinley and his successor, Theodore Roosevelt, and at the end of that time was admitted to the New York bar, becoming a member of the law firm of Shearman & Sterling, in New York City.

He remained with that firm until 1917, when he became senior partner in the newly established firm of Beck, Crawford & Harris. He finally retired from active practice of his profession in 1927 to enter Congress.

In 1920 Warren G. Harding looked about him for a man of the ability and learning to assume the tremendous duties of the office of Solicitor General, and his choice of Mr. Beck was widely applauded, both in this country and abroad, where his talents also were highly regarded.

TRIBUTE FROM COOLIDGE

He served in that office until he voluntarily resigned in 1925, at which time President Coolidge paid warm tribute to his administration of his duties in the following words:

"In accepting your resignation, I wish to make particular acknowledgment of the faithfulness and distinguished ability with which you have discharged the duties of your high position. Your record, as Solicitor General, will stand as one of the most notable proofs that the Government is so many times fortunate in being able to enlist the most eminent of talents and highest fidelity, not because of the compensation, but because of the fine sentiments of patriotism which animate those who thus do honor to the public service. At a great sacrifice to yourself in everything save only reputation you have given your splendid energy and excellent capacity to the furtherance of the national interests. Contemplating your record of achievement, I have to express the hope that it may be like an inspiration and a model to many others."

HANDLED MANY CASES

During Mr. Beck's regime as Solicitor General the work of the Nation's law officer reached a record in volume. The legal debris left by the World War piled up like a log jam damming a mountain freshet, yet largely through his own personal effort Mr. Beck cleared it away.

He had charge of more than 800 cases before the Supreme Court; in other words, he was counsel for the Government of the United States in approximately one-fourth of all of the cases heard by the Supreme Court during the period of his service. In that time he personally and successfully argued more than 100.

Mr. Beck's appearances before the Supreme Court extended over a period of four decades, as he made his first presentation of argument in 1896. Among the cases which he argued are a number which have gone down as classics in the legal history of the Nation, and which are not alone monuments of legal precedent but are mileposts in course in political science.

ARGUED FAMOUS CASES

It was he who argued the famous case of *Neely v. Henkle* (180 U. S. c109), in which the constitutional power of the Government to govern Cuba after the treaty of Paris was involved. This case was regarded as the forerunner of the famous insular cases, which involved the power of the United States to govern permanently colonial dependencies free from the limitation of the "uniformity clause" of the Constitution.

In the famous Danbury Hatters case he successfully argued the application of the Sherman antitrust law to a Nation-wide boycott on a manufacturers' product.

Perhaps the greatest of the cases which he tried before the Supreme Court was the lottery case, in which it was held that the constitutional power to regulate commerce included the power to prohibit commerce for Federal purposes.

Mr. Beck successfully sustained the constitutionality of the Stockyards Act and of the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution, and also argued the famous Portland Postmaster case, wherein the Supreme Court finally settled the century-old controversy as to the President's power of removal. He also took a prominent part in the litigation involving the diversion of water from the Great Lakes, in which the supremacy of the Federal Government was sustained.

Following his retirement from the office of Solicitor General in 1925 Mr. Beck resumed the private practice of the law in New York and Washington, but 2 years later, in 1927, turned his back finally on the profession which he had followed with such brilliance to enter Congress.

ENTERS CONGRESS

In the previous year, in a public address in Philadelphia, he expressed a desire to spend his remaining years in the public service; and the opportunity to enter the lower House of Congress came with the retirement of Congressman James M. Hazlett, then representing the First Congressional District.

Mr. Beck's desire to run for Congress was encouraged by William S. Vare, titular leader of the Philadelphia Republican organization, who then was engaged in his ultimately futile battle to secure his seat in the United States Senate, following the three-cornered fight between himself, Gifford Pinchot, and George Wharton Pepper the previous fall.

The same year that Mr. Vare was elected to the Senate and then compelled to "stand aside", a seat also had been denied Frank L. Smith, of Illinois. The constitutional principle involved intrigued Mr. Beck's legal mind, and he wrote a book, *The Vanishing Rights of the States*, in which he denied the constitutional right of the Senate by a majority vote to exclude from its membership a person unquestionably elected by a sovereign State because of some alleged irregularity in the primary election.

The argument which Mr. Beck used elicited widespread comment, and it was only natural that because of it he should be an active participant in the fight to secure Mr. Vare's induction into the Senate.

FOUGHT FOR EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT REPEAL

Immediately upon his election Mr. Beck took an active part in the effort to secure the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, which, he insisted, had no right in the Constitution, and the modification of the Volstead Act. He was active in the organization of the so-called "wet bloc" in the House, and for several years not only was chairman of the Republican group but the acknowledged spokesman for antiprohibitionists in the House.

He took a leading part in the debates on the question of repeal, and his address on February 7, 1930, coming as it did less than 3 weeks after the final presentation of the moot report of the Wickersham Commission, attracted Nation-wide attention. It was his discussion of the convention system of ratification of the prohibition-repeal amendment late in the Seventy-second Congress which did much to clarify the legal aspects of that infinitely complex and puzzling problem.

HITS CONGRESS; QUILTS

Mr. Beck, in September 1934, announced in a bitterly worded statement that he intended to relinquish his seat in Congress because that body had become "merely a rubber stamp for the Executive." He kept his word and withdrew at the end of the ensuing term of Congress.

"Our form of government can only be saved by the restoration of the Republican Party to power", he said at the time. "I am retiring from Congress because it has largely ceased to be a deliberative body. To be a one-hundredth part of a rubber stamp no longer appeals to me. I believe I can help more effectually in the Federal courts, where I have practiced for more than 50 years, than in a Congress where the minority is gagged and reduced to impotence. I hope with my pen and voice to serve the Republican Party as effectively as in the ranks of Congress."

Following his retirement from Congress he turned his attention, as a constitutional authority, to the New Deal, which he criticized vigorously as "encroaching on individual rights." He described President Roosevelt as a "dictator" and the entire New Deal as a "return to feudalism."

WINS S. H. C. CASE

Before the United States Supreme Court in December 1935 he branded the T. V. A. as unconstitutional, socialistic, and inspired by the New Deal "malevolence" against utilities. The T. V. A., he said, tended to void States' rights.

Another case in which he appeared as counsel was won in the high tribunal last week when the Court upheld the refusal of J. Edward Jones, New York oil-stock dealer, to file information with the Securities Commission under requirements of the Securities Act of 1933.

In an address in Washington early this year he predicted the Roosevelt administration will be known to the future as "the ghastliest wreckage of our form of government in history." He was a critic of the New Deal's tax on inheritances.

URGES COALITION

In February of this year, during a speech in Atlantic City, he advocated a coalition of Republicans and conservative Democrats as the way to "restore public credit by reducing taxation and expenditures."

At the very outset of his congressional career Mr. Beck himself was challenged as to his right to hold a seat, due entirely to the question as to whether or not he maintained a legal residence in Philadelphia. The House voted to seat him after brief debate, after satisfactory evidence had been presented as to his residence at 1414 Spruce Street in this city.

FAMED AS JURIDICAL AUTHOR

Mr. Beck's reputation, both as counselor and orator, was international, and equally so as an author on juridical subjects.

His compilation of an analysis of the various diplomatic papers of the nations which became embroiled in the World War, compiled as a juridical argument to determine the moral responsibility for precipitating the conflict, was accorded almost the dignity of a state paper. His book, *The Evidence in the Case*, not only was widely read in this country but was interpreted and printed abroad. In 1916 he traveled through England and France, making a notable series of addresses in the two allied countries, in which he freely expressed the sympathy of the American people for the allied cause.

WON SCHOLARLY HONORS ABROAD

His scholarly attainments were given generous recognition abroad. Previously made a master of the bench of Gray's Inn, one of the historic Inns of Court in London, where he delivered a series of five addresses under the auspices of the University of London in 1922-23, he was paid the unprecedented compliment of being called to the English bar in 1922. The call was entirely voluntary and made without the time-honored obligation of being "screened" or of participating in the requisite number of dinners at the Inns of Court.

His now famous volume, *The Constitution of the United States*, was an outgrowth of the addresses delivered in London. The foreword of the American edition was written by Calvin Coolidge; that of the British edition by the Earl of Balfour; the French, by Dr. Larnaude, dean of the faculty of law of the University of Paris; and the German, by the Chief Justice of the German Republic.

An evidence of the esteem in which he was held abroad is the fact that he was awarded the rank of officer in the French Legion of Honor, that of commander of the Belgian Order of the Crown, of the Polish Order of Polonia Restituta.

MARVEL FOR MEMORY IN ORATORY

Mr. Beck's reputation as an orator was perhaps as wide as recognition of his legal talents. He was always in demand as an after-dinner speaker in this city, and his feats in memory became classic, particularly among newspapermen, who had the opportunity to appreciate them.

They often would receive copies of Mr. Beck's speech in advance of its delivery, and would have the amazing experience of following his address, page after page, for 20 minutes or a half hour, without detecting him in the omission of a single word or phrase.

Shakespeare was one of his favorite authors, and his speeches were interspersed with quotations from the great Elizabethan dramatist, and he was likewise fond of choosing some conversation or character from the bard to illuminate portions of his addresses.

With a rich voice that might well have graced the stage, a quick wit, and a magnificent command of the English language, he could endow the most abstruse constitutional subject with vitality and glamor.

His ability found exceptional recognition in Congress. On Washington's Birthday, 1929, the House, instead of following its tradition of listening to the reading of Washington's Farewell Address, voted an invitation to Mr. Beck to deliver an address on the First President. He chose Washington and the Constitution, and at the conclusion of the presentation the entire membership of the House rose in the Philadelphian's honor.

STANCHLY LOYAL PHILADELPHIAN

Although his duties in the middle years of his life found him more frequently domiciled in New York, Washington, and abroad than they did in this city, Mr. Beck remained a stanchly loyal Philadelphian and a distinguished publicist of her tradition.

During the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence through the medium of the 1926 Sesquicentennial International Exposition, he served as chairman of the national advisory committee appointed by President Coolidge.

His attainments were freely recognized by institutions of higher learning in this country. He received the honorary degree of doctor of laws from both Moravian and Muhlenberg Colleges in 1902 and from the University of Pennsylvania in 1910, from McGill and Lafayette in 1917; doctor of literature from Franklin and Marshall in 1918 and from Loyola in 1931.

PROLIFIC CONTRIBUTOR TO MAGAZINES

He was a prolific contributor to magazines and periodicals and numerous of his speeches were reprinted in pamphlet form. His formal writings included *The Evidence in the Case*, 1914; *War and Humanity*, 1916; *The Reckoning*, 1918; *The Passing of the New Freedom*, 1920; *The Constitution of the United States*, 1922; *The Vanishing Rights of the States*, 1926; and *May It Please the Court*, 1930.

He was a fellow of the American Philosophical Society, the American Geographical Society, and the Royal Historical Society of London; a member of the Pennsylvania Society of Sons of the Revolution, and a corresponding member of the Societe de Gens de Lettres, of France.

His son, James M. Beck, Jr., has resided in London for many years. His wife is the former Lady Tennyson, sister of Lord Glen-cannon. A daughter is the former wife of S. Pinckney Tuck, a member of the American Foreign Service.

Mr. Beck was a member of the Metropolitan Club and the Chevy Chase Country Club of Washington, the Art and Legal Clubs of Philadelphia, and of the Shakespeare Society of Philadelphia, reputed to be the oldest organization of its kind in the world, and a member of the Union League Club of New York.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LARRABEE, for 1 week, on account of important business.

To Mr. STARNES (at the request of Mr. HILL of Alabama), indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. WIGGLESWORTH (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinitely.

To Mr. WALLGREN (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Washington), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. MAY (at the request of Mr. SPENCE), for today, on account of unavoidable absence.

To Mr. McFARLANE, for 1 week, on account of death in family.

To Mr. LANHAM (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas), for 2 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. CROWE, for today, on account of official business.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 233. Joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the Great Lakes Exposition to be held in the State of Ohio during the year 1936, and authorizing the President to invite the Dominion of Canada to participate therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did, on April 11, 1936, present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 11849. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Library of Congress Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1935; and

H. J. Res. 526. Joint resolution to authorize the Librarian of Congress to accept the property devised and bequeathed to the United States of America by the last will and testament of Joseph Pennell, deceased.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 14, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARING

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Tuesday, April 14, 1936, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in room 328, House Office Building, to consider further H. R. 10357, and other bills.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

772. A letter from the past commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, transmitting pursuant to Public Resolution No. 126, Seventy-first Congress, approved March 2, 1931, the journal of the proceedings of the Sixty-ninth National Encampment, held at Grand Rapids, Mich.,

September 8-14, 1935 (H. Doc. No. 347); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

773. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution to amend the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928 for the purpose of extending for 2 additional years the time within which American nationals who have obtained awards from the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, or the Tri-Partite Claims Commission, Austria and Hungary, and the Hungarian nationals who have obtained awards from the War Claims Arbitration, may make application to the Treasury for the payment of such awards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

774. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting for the consideration of Congress a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, to remain available until expended, for the War Department, for construction of runways, grading, and drainage at the Army Air Corps base at Langley Field, Va. (H. Doc. No. 444); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

775. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting for the consideration of Congress, deficiency and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year 1937 and prior years amounting to \$2,344,701.80, together with drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 445); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 485. Resolution providing for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 230; without amendment (Rept. No. 2395). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 7764. A bill to relieve restricted Indians whose lands have been taxed or have been lost by failure to pay taxes, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WERNER: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 9156. A bill to define the exterior boundary of the Ute Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2399). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEMPSEY: Committee on Insular Affairs. H. R. 12119. A bill to amend sections 13 and 19 of the act of March 2, 1917, entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 12033. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., certain public lands in California; and granting rights-of-way over public lands and reserve lands to the city of Los Angeles in Mono County in the State of California; with amendment (Rept. No. 2401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 10641. A bill providing for the protection and conservation of equities, easements, or rights accruing to the Government because of lands granted for the purpose of aiding in the building or establishment of railroads; with amendment (Rept. No. 2402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 3789. An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to convey the Charleston Army Base Terminal to the city of Charleston, S. C.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5503. A bill authorizing the President to order Maj. E. P. Duval before a retiring board for a hearing of his case, and upon the findings of such board determine whether or not he be placed on the retired list with the rank and pay held by him at the time of his resignation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KNUTE HILL: A bill (H. R. 12253) to amend acts fixing the rate of payment of irrigation construction costs on the Wapato Indian irrigation project, Yakima, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MAAS: A bill (H. R. 12254) providing for naval and Marine Corps aviators who have qualified prior to April 1, 1917, and since disqualified for active duty to be advanced one grade on the retired list; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 12255) to amend section 601 of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington: A bill (H. R. 12256) to provide for the construction of a post-office building at Pe Ell, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 12257) to extend the jurisdiction of the United States Court for China to offenses committed on the high seas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN: A bill (H. R. 12258) for the improvement and protection of the beaches along the shores of the United States; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DALY: A bill (H. R. 12259) authorizing the appointment of an additional circuit court judge for the third circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY: A bill (H. R. 12260) prescribing a condition precedent to the award of certain contracts by Federal agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH: A bill (H. R. 12261) to aid and promote scientific research of a basic character upon which the inception and development of new industries or the expansion of established industries is dependent, to encourage increased effort on the part of individuals toward the further advancement of scientific knowledge and discovery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma (by departmental request): A bill (H. R. 12262) to reserve certain public domain in Montana as an addition to the Rocky Boy Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENBOGEN: A bill (H. R. 12263) to further amend the National Housing Act, to provide relief for merchants who suffered losses by flood, earthquake, conflagration, tornado, cyclone, hurricane, or other catastrophe occurring in the year 1936, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 12264) for a Coast Guard station at or near Dunkirk, N. Y.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DARDEN: A bill (H. R. 12265) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT: Resolution (H. Res. 486) to appoint a select committee to investigate elevator accidents and fatalities, which have occurred in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 566) providing for the contribution by the United States to the expense of the tercentenary celebration by the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 12266) for the relief of Carrie M. Clements, widow, and Margie P. Clements, James D. Clements, and Elieza V. Ball, children of Dr. David Oscar Clements, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 12267) for the relief of Francis M. Heinzelmann; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 12268) for the relief of Maj. Lyman S. Frasier; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DARDEN: A bill (H. R. 12269) directing the Court of Claims to reopen the case of William G. Maupin, Jr., and others against the United States, docket no. 34681, and to correct the errors therein, if any, by an additional judgment against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12270) directing the Court of Claims to reopen certain cases and to correct the errors therein, if any, by additional judgments against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HANCOCK of New York: A bill (H. R. 12271) granting an increase of pension to Frances Eggleston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 12272) for the relief of Frank Wheelock Plummer Breed; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HEALEY: A bill (H. R. 12273) for the relief of Thomas Edward Connors; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12274) for the relief of John McAnneny; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 12275) granting a pension to George McCauley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 12276) for the relief of John Bernard Stroh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETTENGILL: A bill (H. R. 12277) granting a pension to Anna Mendel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 12278) for the relief of Jacob N. Lahr and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 12279) granting a pension to Bertha J. Runck; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILCOX: A bill (H. R. 12280) to amend Private Act No. 210, approved August 13, 1935, by substituting as payee therein the Clark Dredging Co., in lieu of the Bowers Southern Dredging Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12281) for the relief of Harry Kukofsky; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10711. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Central Trades and Labor Council of Greater New York and vicinity, concerning the Pearson bill (H. R. 9258); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

10712. Also, petition of the International Association of Machinists, New York City, concerning the Wheeler-Crosser bills (S. 4174 and H. R. 11609); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10713. By Mr. HESS: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Ninety-first General Assembly of Ohio, memorializing Congress to assume the local assessments of the Muskingum watershed conservancy district; to the Committee on Flood Control.

10714. By Mr. KENNEY: Petition of the New Jersey branch of the International Order of the King's Daughters and Sons, Inc. (approximately 1,600 members), endorsing the Pettengill and Neely bill (compulsory block booking and blind selling of motion pictures); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10715. Also, resolution of the Polish Peoples' Home in Passiac, N. J., favoring the enactment of the Ellenbogen national textile act, unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of textile workers, March 15, 1936; to the Committee on Labor.

10716. By Mr. LAMNECK: Petition of Mrs. Clyde J. Wells, president, and Mrs. S. D. Bradner, secretary, Northern Junior Circle, the Child Conservation League, of Ohio, urging early hearings on motion-picture bills now before Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10717. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of the Assembly of the State of New York, that the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully memorialized to appropriate annually to the use of the State of New York the sum of \$2,500,000 for the maintenance and operating expenses of the New York State canal system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10718. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce, Hamburg, N. Y., opposing the Wheeler-Crosser bills (S. 4174 and H. R. 11609) affecting railroads, express companies, and certain other common carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 1936

(Legislative day of Monday, Feb. 24, 1936)

IMPEACHMENT OF HALSTED L. RITTER

The Senate, sitting for the trial of the articles of impeachment against Halsted L. Ritter, judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida, met at 12 o'clock meridian.

The managers on the part of the House, Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS, of Texas; Hon. RANDOLPH PERKINS, of New Jersey; and Hon. SAM HOBBS, of Alabama, accompanied by the clerk of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, Elmore Whitehurst, and by Thomas M. Mulherin, special agent, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, appeared in the seats provided for them.

The respondent, Halsted L. Ritter, with his counsel, Frank P. Walsh, Esq., and Carl T. Hoffman, Esq., and R. O. Cullen, Esq., of Miami, Fla., associated with Mr. Hoffman, appeared in the seats assigned them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms by proclamation will open the proceedings of the Senate sitting for the trial of the articles of impeachment.

The Sergeant at Arms made the usual proclamation.

On request of Mr. ASHURST, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the Senate, sitting for the trial of the articles of impeachment, for Monday, April 13, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

LIST OF ADDITIONAL WITNESSES SUBPENAED

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Sergeant at Arms, which will be printed in the RECORD.

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
Washington, D. C., April 14, 1936.

Hon. JOHN N. GARNER,
Vice President, and President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: There are attached hereto a list of additional witnesses for the Government submitted to me by the managers on the part of the House of Representatives, and a list of additional witnesses for the respondent submitted to me by his counsel, all of said witnesses to be subpoenaed for the trial of Halsted L. Ritter, United States district judge for the southern district of Florida.

There are also attached hereto original subpoenas served on the witnesses desired by both parties, said subpoenas being duly served as shown by my report on the back thereof, and return made according to law.

Respectfully,

CHESLEY W. JURNERY,
Sergeant at Arms.

ADDITIONAL LIST OF WITNESSES SUBPENAED FOR THE RESPONDENT

Mrs. Eleanor I. Balsley, 1535 Leland Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; Louis P. Elsner, 72 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; James M. Owens, Jr., tax assessor, West Palm Beach, Fla.

ADDITIONAL LIST OF WITNESSES SUBPENAED FOR THE UNITED STATES

Carl Tegder, Orlando, Fla.

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Clark	Keyes	Radcliffe
Ashurst	Connally	King	Reynolds
Austin	Coolidge	La Follette	Robinson
Bachman	Copeland	Logan	Russell
Bailey	Couzens	Loneragan	Schwellenbach
Barbour	Davis	Long	Sheppard
Barkley	Donahay	McAdoo	Shipstead
Benson	Duffy	McGill	Smith
Bilbo	Fletcher	McKellar	Steiner
Black	Frazier	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	George	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Borah	Gerry	Metcalf	Townsend
Brown	Gibson	Minton	Truman
Bulkley	Glass	Moore	Tydings
Bulow	Guffey	Murphy	Vandenberg
Burke	Hale	Murray	Van Nuys
Byrd	Harrison	Norris	Wagner
Byrnes	Hastings	Nye	Walsh
Capper	Hatch	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Caraway	Hayden	Overton	White
Carey	Holt	Pittman	
Chavez	Johnson	Pope	

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] are absent because of illness, and that the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DRETERICH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are unavoidably detained from the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

(At this point, as in legislative session, on request of Mr. ASHURST, the special order set for Wednesday, Apr. 15, was postponed to Wednesday, Apr. 29. Mr. ASHURST's request appears elsewhere in today's RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

(At this point, on request of Mr. ROBINSON and by unanimous consent, the Senate, sitting for the trial of the articles of impeachment, suspended its session in order that the Senate might receive a message from the President of the United States by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries. The message having been received, and noted elsewhere in the RECORD of today's legislative proceedings, on motion of Mr. ROBINSON, the Senate resumed its session sitting for the trial of the articles of impeachment.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Do the counsel for the respondent desire to proceed with the argument?

Mr. WALSH (of counsel). Yes, Mr. President.

ARGUMENT IN BEHALF OF RESPONDENT BY FRANK P. WALSH, ESQ. (CONT.)

Mr. WALSH (of counsel). May it please the Court, as I concluded the remarks I was making yesterday evening I was at the point of adverting to the circumstances surrounding the making of the final decree in the Whitehall case.

Before I do that, however, I wish to call attention to one fact, one circumstance I think is overwhelming in this record, which shows that the conduct of Judge Ritter—and I think I can rest the whole case on that point—was absolutely right and was so considered by everybody connected with the litigation, including everyone who had any objection to the procedure followed in that case. Remember this was a class case. It was brought for the benefit, not of one bondholder, but of all. Once it was started, no matter who objected, it could not be stopped. There was an intervener. I do not care how the intervener got in, if the judge saw him simply as an intervener, he was powerless to stop the suit, and on that proposition there is no countervailing evidence in this case.

There is a statute that fully protects each litigant, namely, title 28, section 25, of the Judicial Code, and I say that the remedy provided by the Congress of the United States in this matter is the most effective remedy that one can find in any court in the Union. It provides that if, in the judgment of any of the parties, the court is biased or prejudiced against or in favor of any party to the suit, that party has a right to file an affidavit.